

AUG 23 1922

Vol. XLIII, 3

WHOLE No. 171

GEN. LIBRARY
AUG 23 1922
UNIV. OF MICH.

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK,
WILFRED P. MUSTARD, D. M. ROBINSON

JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER
1922

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.—St. Augustine's Method of Composing and Delivering Sermons. By ROY J. DEFERRARI,	193
II.—Die Entstehung des absoluten Infinitivs im Griechischen. By ARNOLD ROSETH,	220
III.—Virginia Georgica. By HERBERT C. LIPSCOMB,	228
IV.—Biblical Studies. By PAUL HAUPT,	238
V.—The Fasti of Ovid and the Augustan Propaganda. By KATHARINE ALLEN,	250
REPORTS:	267
Philologus LXXVI (1920), Heft 3/4.—Hermes LV (1920), 3 und 4.	
REVIEWS:	276
Michelson's The Owl Sacred Pack of the Fox Indians.—Lorimer's The Phenology of the Bakhtiari, Badakhshani, and Madaglashti Dialects of Modern Persian.—'Gerullis' Die altpreussischen Ortsnamen.—White's Ausonius.—Ferro's The Ruin of Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity.	
BOOKS RECEIVED,	286

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 50 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLIII, 3

WHOLE No. 171

I.—ST. AUGUSTINE'S METHOD OF COMPOSING AND DELIVERING SERMONS.

(Concluded from p. 123.)

VII. EVIDENCES OF SPONTANEITY AND EXTEMPORIZATION IN THE SERMONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE.

Augustine's sermons are literally filled with evidences of spontaneity and extemporization. Passages strike us on all sides which show the enthusiasm and the inspiration of the preacher speaking extemporaneously and without written assistance. These sermons could be dissected and all the parts marshalled under different headings but the mass of material would be so great that the reader would have almost the entire body of sermons arrayed before him. It is our intention here merely to indicate the various kinds of remarks which bear on our subject, quote several passages by way of illustration, and refer to several more in the foot-notes. Any attempt even to refer to all is out of the question, as one may easily see on glancing over Augustine's sermons with the various sections of this chapter in mind.

Augustine's homilies give abundant proof that the principles which he enunciated for preaching the word of God were derived directly from his own practice. When Augustine preached, it was his sympathetic and sincere nature combined with a vigor and power to express the thoughts of that nature, which carried him on and on, generally to the complete captivation of his congregation. There are numerous passages in the sermons which indicate such moments of high enthusiasm. Furthermore,

these expressions are such as we do not believe even Augustine could have conceived in the quiet of his study.¹

Examples of high flights of rhetoric meet us on all sides. It is easy for Augustine, while enforcing the significance of some truth, to fall into the rhetoric of Asianism, the rapid fire of choppy sentences, imperatives and rhetorical questions.

In the course of a sermon, "On Jacob and Esau," given on the feast of the martyr Vincent, Augustine has had occasion to speak of God in the various conceptions of Him as the Light. Just what do we mean when we speak of God as "the Light of Truth," "the Light of Justice," etc.?

Conamini cogitare, fratres, lumen veritatis, lucem sapientiae, quomodo ubique praesens est omnibus: conamini cogitare lumen iustitiae; praesens est enim omni cogitanti. Quid enim est quod cogitat? Qui vult iniuste vivere, peccat. Deserit iustitiam: diminuta est? Conversus est ad iustitiam: quid? aucta est? Deserit eam, integram illam relinquit: convertitur ad eam, integram illam invenit. Quid est ergo lumen iustitiae? De oriente hoc surgit, et in occidentem vadit? An est alius locus unde oritur, aut quo venit? Nonne ubique praesto est? Homo certe qui est in occidente, si vult iuste vivere, id est, secundum iustitiam, numquid deest illi quam intueatur et videat secundum ipsam iustitiam? Iterum in oriente positus si velit iuste vivere, id est, secundum eandem iustitiam, numquid deest illi?²

In such bursts of eloquence also, Augustine under the influence of the pagan schools of rhetoric often falls into the use of short sentences or clauses ending with the same word or syllable, thus giving a sing-song or rhythmical swing to his speech.

Thus after Augustine has quoted Math. xviii. 15 (But if thy brother shall offend against thee, go and rebuke him between thee and him alone) and 1 Tim. v. 20 (Them that sin reprove before all: that the rest also may have fear), he remarks that these statements of Christ appear to conflict. This can not be, however, for if we are at peace with our conscience, we shall find nothing contradictory in the Holy Scriptures; and Augustine goes on to examine the apparent contradiction.

Duo ergo ista praecepta, fratres, sic audiamus, ut intelligamus, et inter utraque praecepta pacati constituamur. Cum corde nostro nos

¹ For Augustine's prose style in general, cf. Norden, *op. cit.*, 2² *passim*.

² 4, 7. Cf. also 34, 6; 49, 8; 196, 1; 213, 1; 224, 3.

concordemus, et Scriptura sancta in nulla parte discordat. Verum est omnino, utrumque verum est: sed discernere debemus, aliquando illud, aliquando illud esse faciendum; aliquando corripiendum fratrem inter te et ipsum solum, aliquando corripiendum fratrem coram omnibus, ut et caeteri timorem habeant. Si aliquando illud, aliquando illud fecerimus; concordiam Scripturarum tenebimus, et in faciendo atque obtemperando non errabimus. Sed dicit mihi aliquis: Quando facio illud, quando illud; ne tunc corripiam inter me et ipsum solum, quando debeo coram omnibus corripere; aut tunc corripiam coram omnibus, quando debeo in secreto corripere?³

Augustine is not at all averse to indulging in a little bitter irony in the midst of these outbursts. In a sermon delivered to a congregation composed principally of the recently baptized, Augustine urges that they maintain carefully their newly-acquired purity. "Imitate the good, not the evil," he says. And here he takes the opportunity to score sinners in general. "Sinners should reform, while they have the opportunity, for death comes suddenly. They always say, 'We will reform,' but to the question 'When?,' the answer ever returns like the voice of a crow 'Cras, cras' (Tomorrow, tomorrow)."

Corrigant se qui tales sunt, dum vivunt; ne postea velint, et non possint: quia subito venit mors, et non est qui corrigatur, sed qui in ignem mittatur. Et quando veniat ipsa novissima hora, nescitur, et dicitur, Corrigo. Quando corrigis, quando mutaris? Cras, inquis. Ecce quoties dicis, Cras, cras; factus es corvus. Ecce dico tibi, cum facis vocem corvinam, occurrit tibi ruina. Nam ille corvus, cuius vocem imitaris, exiit de arca et non rediit (Gen. 8, 7). Tu autem, frater, redi in Ecclesiam, quam tunc illa arca significabat.⁴

Very often Augustine is not carried away by a flow of rhetoric, but his sympathetic and kindly nature shows itself in every word as he speaks very informally and familiarly with his congregation. He descends among them as it were and clearly speaks under the impulse of the moment.

For example, Augustine again and again reviews in an informal way what has just been said, in order to impress his teaching more securely on the minds of his people. When in one sermon he has finished talking about the Trinity, before commencing a new topic, he sums up informally what he has already said.

³ 82, 9. Cf. also 164, 10; 178, 7.

⁴ 224, 4.

Exsolvimus quae promisimus: propositiones nostras firmissimis, ut arbitror, testimoniorum documentis probavimus. Tenete quod audistis. Breviter replico, et rem utilissimam, quantum existimo, mentibus vestris collocandam commendo. Pater non est natus de virgine: nativitatem tamen istam Filii et Pater et Filius operatus est ex virgine. Pater non est passus in cruce: passionem tamen Filii et Pater et Filius operatus est. Non resurrexit Pater a mortuis: resurrectionem tamen Filii et Pater et Filius operatus est. Habetis personarum distinctionem, et operationis inseparabilitatem. Non ergo dicamus, aliquid Patrem operari sine Filio, aliquid Filium sine Patre. An forte miracula quae fecit Iesus, movent vos, ne forte aliqua ipse fecerit, quae non fecit Pater? Et ubi est, Pater autem in me manens, ipse facit opera (John 14, 10)? Haec quae diximus plana erant, tantum dicenda erant: non laborandum ut intelligerentur, sed curandum ut commemorarentur.*

Only too often Augustine's kindliness takes the form of an apology for his inability as an expositor. These expressions may often seem like the ordinary utterances of a trained orator, a trick of the trade as it were, but frequently as in the following example they are too profuse and appear too sincere to be considered as the words of a professional etiquette.

Quid sit autem hoc, adiuvante Domino, dicam ut potero: adestote, ut intelligatis, si Spiritu ambulatis. Hoc si non intelligatur, periculosissime auditur. Ideo sollicitus ne male homines intelligendo pereant, suscepi haec verba Apostoli, adiuvante Domino, exponere vestrae Charitatis. Vacat nobis, matutina coepimus, hora prandii non urget: ad istum diem, id est sabbatum, maxime hi assolent convenire, qui esuriunt verbum Dei. Audite, et attendite; dicam quantum potero diligenter.*

Occasionally in a kindly spirit Augustine asks his people to have a little patience. He does not wish to overtax their strength, but something still remains to be treated, which can not be passed over in silence. In such statements too we are often dealing with ordinary rhetorical platitudes, but frequently, as below, with expressions of real sincerity. In any case the passages are clearly extemporizations.

Restant duae quaestiones: sed vereor ne oneri sim iam fastidientibus, item timeo ne fraudem adhuc esurientes. Memini tamen quid solverim, et quid debeam. Restat enim videre quid sit, Nesciat sinistra tua quid faciat dextera tua: et de dilectione inimici, cur antiquis videbatur data licentia ut odissent inimicos, quorum nobis imperatur dilectio. Sed

* 52, 14.

* 128, 6. Cf. also 89, 4; 179, 7; 292, 2.

quid facio? Si breviter de his disseram, fortassis non ita ut oportet intelligar: si diutius, timeo ne plus gravem vos onere sermonis, quam fructu expositionis sublevem. Sed certe si minus quam satis est, intellexeritis; adhuc me tenete debitorem, ut alio tempore ista plenius disserantur. Tamen nunc non oportet ea sic relinqui, ut omnino nihil inde dicatur. Sinistra est animi cupiditas carnalis, dextera est animi charitas spiritualis, etc.⁷

At times Augustine is at a loss for the proper words with which to express his thoughts, and he frankly says so to his congregation. He explains and explains again, and finally he becomes satisfied that he has driven his point home. Thus in his sermon on the two blind men (Math. 20. 30-34), while explaining the significance of the two blind men calling on Christ to cure them, and the crowd that bade them hold their peace, he says:

Et caetera talia turba clamat ne caeci clament. Turba clamantes corripiebat: sed eorum clamores non vincebat. Intelligant quid faciant, qui volunt sanari. Et nunc Iesus transit: qui iuxta viam sunt, clament. Hi sunt enim qui labiis honorant, cor autem eorum longe est a deo. Ipsi sunt iuxta viam, quibus praecipit Dominus obtritis corde. Nam cum recitantur ea quae fecit Dominus transeuntia, semper nobis exhibetur transiens Iesus. Quia usque in finem saeculi non desunt caeci sedentes ad viam. Opus ergo est ut clament illi iuxta viam sedentes. Turba quae cum Domino erat, compescebat clamorem quaerentium sanitatem. Fratres, videtis quid dicam? Nescio enim quomodo dicam: sed plus nescio quomodo taceam. Hoc dico, et aperte dico. Timeo enim Iesum transeuntem et manentem: et ideo tacere non possum. Bonos Christianos, vere studiosos, volentes facere praecepta Dei, quae in Evangelio scripta sunt, Christiani mali et tepidi prohibent. Turba ipsa quae cum Domino est, prohibet clamantes; id est, prohibet bene operantes, ne perseverando sanentur, etc.⁸

Occasionally during a sermon, Augustine drops a remark regarding the nature of his congregation.

Unde hortamur Charitatem vestram, maxime quia vos videmus frequentius convenisse, qui propositum altius habetis, id est, in ipso corpore Christi ex eius munere, non meritis vestris, excellentiorem locum tenetis, habentes conscientiam quae a Deo donata est.⁹

The Bishop of Hippo at times thinks of what some may say by way of criticism of his sermon, and he makes a considerable

⁷ 149, 15. Cf. also 111, 2.

⁸ 88, 13.

⁹ 354, 3.

digression to assure his audience that he will hear of it and will answer it fully.

Post sermonem meum locuturi sunt homines; sed et quodlibet homines loquantur, qualicumque aura flante, perducetur inde aliquid ad aures meas. Et si fuerit tale, ut sit iterum necesse nos purgare, respondebo detractoribus, respondebo maledicis, respondebo incredulis, non nobis credentibus praepositis suis, ut potero, respondebo quod Dominus dederit: interim modo non est necesse, quia nihil forte dicturi sunt. Qui nos amant, libere gaudebunt: qui nos oderunt, tacite dolebunt. Tamen si linguas exercuerint, audient, Deo propitio, vobiscum responsionem meam, non litem meam. Non enim homines nominaturus sum et dicturus, Ille hoc dixit, iste sic detraxit; cum fortasse etiam ad me falsa, quia et hoc potest fieri, perferantur. Verumtamen quaecumque perlata fuerint, si oportere videbitur, loquar inde Charitati vestrae.¹⁰

Very frequently Augustine refers to the time which he has devoted to his discourse. "We have explained our subject in too short a time, but accept it as it is, or hold us responsible for another explanation later."

Iam nunc quia ut potuimus, quaestionem profundam in tantilla temporis brevitate solvimus; aut si nondum solvimus, debitores, ut dixi, teneamur: illud potius breviter videamus de remissione peccatorum.¹¹

Non est nunc tempus hortari vos, ut potius aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos aedificetis, quam lignum, fenum, stipulam, super tam magnum et validum fundamentum: sed tamen breviter dictum sic accipite, quasi diu et multis verbis dictum.¹²

At this time congregations usually sat during the service except for the Gospel, when they rose and remained standing during the sermon. In Italy only did they become seated at the end of the reading of the Gospel.¹³ As a preacher Augustine usually remained seated while speaking, although sometimes he states expressly that he is standing. In several sermons Augustine takes occasion to refer to the position of the congregation and of the preacher, usually as a sort of appeal or exhortation for greater patience, yet always clearly on the spur of the moment.

Nostis, fratres, quia ad panem ventris cum labore pervenitur, quanto

¹⁰ 356, 12.

¹¹ 99, 7.

¹² 362, 9. Cf. also 51, 17.

¹³ Cf. Ferrarius, *op. cit.*, 265.

magis ad panem mentis? Cum labore statis et auditis, sed nos cum maiore stamus et loquimur.¹⁴

Quomodo autem inter se omnes conveniant, nec veritati, quae per alium promitur, ab alio repugnetur, quisquis nosse desiderat, non in his sermonibus, sed in aliis laboriosis litteris quaerat; nec stando, aut audiendo, sed potius sedendo et legendo, vel legenti aurem mentemque intentissimam praebendo, ille condiscat.¹⁵

The beginnings and ends of sermons most often contain statements which clearly show spontaneity and indicate that Augustine spoke without any sort of written guidance.

It seems to have been the regular custom for a preacher to demand silence and attention of his congregation before beginning his sermon, just as the pagan orators did of their hearers before beginning their orations.¹⁶ While all of Augustine's sermons do not contain this exhortation at the beginning, many of them do, and all such instances appear very colloquial and familiar, and not at all formal or stereotyped.

Hesternae lectionis debitores nos esse meminimus: sed sicut nos debemus sermonem, ita et vos debetis audientiam.¹⁷

Audivimus, concorditerque respondimus, et Deo nostro consona voce cantavimus: Beatus vir quem tu erudieris, Domine, et ex lege tua docueris eum (Psal. 93, 12). Silentium si praebeatis, audietis.¹⁸

Augustine did not always ask for attention in the opening sentence. Often when his subject was particularly important, he would first spend a minute or two in explanation, and then with all the more reason demand attention.

Diei hodiernae festivas anniversario reditu memoriam renovat, natum esse Domini praecursorem ante mirabilem mirabiliter; cuius nativitatem considerare nos et laudare maxime hodie convenit. Ad hoc enim et dies anniversarius huic miraculo dedicatus est, ut beneficia Dei et excelsi magnalia non debeat oblivio de cordibus nostris. Ioannes ergo praeco Domini missus ante illum, sed factus per illum. Omnia enim per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil. Missus homo

¹⁴ Tractate 19 on Gospel of John, 17.

¹⁵ Tractate 112 (§ 1) on Gospel of John. Cf. also Concio ad Psalmum 32; Expositio Psalmi 147; 17, 2; 23, 1; 23, 2; 43, 7; 95, 2; 274, 1; 355, 2; App. 75 (rejected as not genuine). It has been thought advisable to quote all instances here because of the interest of the general subject-matter.

¹⁶ Cf. Ferrarius, op. cit., 281.

¹⁷ 4, 1.

¹⁸ 153, 1.

ante hominem Deum, agnoscens Dominum suum, annuntians Creatorem suum; iam in terra praesentem mente discernens, digito ostendens. Ipsius enim verba sunt ostendentis Dominum et testimonium perhibentis, Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccatum mundi (Ioan. 1, 3, 29). Merito ergo sterilis peperit praeconem, virgo iudicem. In matre Ioannis sterilitas accepit fecunditatem: in matre Christi fecunditas non corruptit integritatem. Si vestra patientia et quietum studium, et attentum silentium praebeat mihi copiam, adiuvante Domino, dicere quod donat ut dicam; erit procul dubio fructus attentionis vestrae, et operae pretium studii nostri, ut aliquid quod ad magnum sacramentum pertineat, insinuem auribus et cordibus vestris.²⁸

On one occasion, while asking for attention in the regular way, Augustine notices that his audience is larger and more alert than usual, and surmises the reason. "I interested you," he says, "in the last sermon, so you are very anxious to hear me go on. Well, pay very good attention, for I will first give the sermon which is regularly due, and then I will proceed to talk on the Church."

Ex eo quod hesterno die intentam fecimus Charitatem vestram, intelligimus vos alacrius et numerosius convenisse: sed interim lectioni evangelicae ex ordine sermonem debitum reddamus, si placet; deinde audiet Charitas vestra de pace Ecclesiae vel quid egerimus, vel quid adhuc agendum speremus. Nunc ergo tota intentio cordis ad Evangelium feratur, nemo aliunde cogitet. Si enim qui totus adest, vix capit; qui se per cogitationes diversas dividit, nonne et quod ceperat fundit? Meminit autem Charitas vestra Dominico praeterito, quantum Dominus adiuuvare dignatus est, disseruisse nos de spirituali regeneratione (in the previous tractate): quam lectionem vobis iterum legi fecimus, ut quae tunc non dicta sunt, in Christi nomine adiuvantibus orationibus vestris impleamus.²⁹

Again, Augustine recognizes at once when his audience is well disposed to pay attention. "I am sure," he says, "that you all have tried your utmost to understand the Gospel as it was being read, and I feel certain that you all have understood it at least in part. Yet few, perhaps, have understood it entirely, and with God's help I will try to make it entirely clear to all."

Quod modo audivimus et intenti accepimus, cum sanctum Evangelium legeretur, non dubito quod omnes etiam intelligere conati sumus: et

²⁸ 288, 1. Cf. also Enarrat. 3 in Ps. 36, 1; 42, 1; 46, 1; 145, 2; 152, 1; 153, 1; 177, 1; 180, 1; 356, 1.

²⁹ Tractate 12 on Gospel of John.

quisque nostrum de re tam magna quae lecta est, pro suo modulo cepit quod potuit et posito pane verbi, nemo est qui se queratur nihil gustasse. Sed iterum non dubito, quia difficile quisquam est qui totum intellexerit. Tamen etiamsi est qui omnia verba Domini nostri Iesu Christi modo ex Evangelio recitata satis intelligat; toleret ministerium nostrum, quousque, si possimus, illo adiuvante tractando faciamus ut vel omnes vel multi intelligant, quod se pauci intellexisse laetantur.²¹

At times several things casually occur to Augustine which he mentions before he begins the sermon proper. Thus on one occasion he reminds his listeners that he is going to take up the subject which he was to have discussed on Christmas day, but had postponed because so many people were present who had come merely to witness the celebration of the feast and not to hear a sermon. Today he feels sure that the people have come to listen. Furthermore a pagan festival is being celebrated on that day and many Christians have stayed away from the service to join this celebration. Accordingly Augustine is moved in a twofold manner: with sadness that some of his people have been enticed away to take part in pagan rites, with joy that the others in spite of all have come to hear the word of God.

Exspectationem Charitatis vestrae ille impleat, qui excitavit. Etsi enim quae dicenda sunt vobis, non nostra, sed Dei esse praesumimus; tamen multo magis nos dicimus, quod humiliter dicit Apostolus: Habemus thesaurum istum in vasis fictilibus, ut eminentia virtutis Dei sit, et non ex nobis (II Cor. 4, 7). Non dubitamus itaque meminisse vos pollicitationis nostrae. In ipso promisimus, per quem nunc reddimus. Nam et cum promitteremus, ab ipso petebamus: et cum reddimus, ab ipso accipimus. Meminit autem Charitas vestra nos matutina Natalis Domini distulisse quam solvendam proposuimus quaestionem; quia multi nobiscum, etiam quibus solet esse onerosus sermo Dei, solemnitatem illam diei debitam celebrabant. Nunc vero puto neminem convenisse, nisi qui audire desiderat. Non itaque loquimur cordibus surdis, non fastidientibus animis. Haec autem vestra expectatio, pro me oratio est. Accessit aliquid; quia et dies Muneris multos hinc ventilavit, pro quorum quidem salute quantum satagimus, tantum fratres ut satagatis hortamur; et pro his qui nondum intenti sunt spectaculis veritatis, sed dediti sunt spectaculis carnis, intenta mente deprecemini Deum. Novi enim, et certe scio esse modo in numero vestro eos qui hodie contempserunt: sed rumpunt ea quae consuerunt. Mutantur enim homines, et in melius et in deterius. Quotidianis huiuscemodi experimentis vicissim et laetamur et contristamur; laetamur correctis, contristamur depravatis. Ideoque Dominus

²¹ Tractate 34 on Gospel of John.

non ait saluum futurum esse qui coeperit; sed, Qui perseveraverit, inquit, usque in finem, hic saluus erit (Matt. 10, 22).²²

At the beginning of his sermons too the size of his congregation calls forth his praise or his censure as the case may be. He is very much pleased on one occasion when his congregation in spite of the inclemency of the weather is present in large numbers.

Fateor Sanctitati vestrae, timueram ne frigus hoc frigidus vos ad conveniendum faceret: sed quia ista celebritate et frequentia vestra, spiritu vos fervere demonstratis, non dubito quia etiam orastis pro me, ut debitum vobis exsolvam.²³

Then again Augustine is grieved when on the feast of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, he finds an audience before him which does not do proper honor to the greatness of the occasion.

Debuimus quidem tantorum martyrum diem, hoc est, sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli, maiore frequentia celebrare. Si enim celebramus frequentissime natalitia agnorum, quanto magis debemus arietum? . . . Haec loquor, charissimi, laetus quidem hodierno die propter tantam festivitatem, sed aliquantulum tristis, quia non video tantum populum congregatum, quantus congregari debuit in Natali passionis Apostolorum. Si lateret nos non nobis imputaretur: si autem neminem latet, quae est ista tanta pigritia? Non amatis Petrum et Paulum? Ego in vobis illis loquor qui hic non sunt. Nam vobis ago gratias quia vel vos venistis. Et potest animus cuiusque christiani non amare Petrum et Paulum? Si adhuc frigidus est, legat et amet: si adhuc non amat, sagittam verbi in cor accipiat.²⁴

In closing his sermons Augustine shows again and again that he is speaking under the impulse of the moment. He frequently says that he has much more to discuss, but will not speak longer because he is unwilling to burden his hearers. Much of this may indeed be pure rhetoric, but it all bears the appearance of spontaneity. Thus in his sermon on John 1. 33 (And I knew him not; but he who sent me to baptize with water, said to me: He upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining upon him, he it is that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost), he concludes,

²² 51, 1.

²³ Tractate 6 on Gospel of John. Cf. also Tractate 7 on Gospel of John; 198.

²⁴ 298, 1 and 2.

Non respuo Ioannem, sed potius credo Ioanni. Quid credo Ioanni? Quod didicit per columbam. Quid didicit per columbam? Hic est qui baptizat in Spiritu sancto. Iam ergo, fratres, tenete hoc, et cordibus vestris infigite. Si enim hodie voluero plenius dicere quare per columbam, tempus non sufficit. Quia enim res discenda insinuata est Ioanni per columbam, quam non noverat in Christo Ioannes, quamvis iam nosset Christum, exposui quantum arbitror Sanctitati vestrae: sed quare hanc ipsam rem per columbam oportuit demonstrari, si breviter dici posset, dicerem: sed quia diu dicendum est, et onerare vos nolo, quomodo adiutus sum orationibus vestris, ut illud quod promisi, implem; adiuvante etiam atque etiam pia intentione et votis bonis, et illud apparebit vobis, quare Ioannes quod didicit in Domino, quia ipse est qui baptizat in Spiritu sancto, et nulli servo suo translegavit potestatem baptizandi, non debuit discere nisi per columbam.²⁵

Augustine ends his sermons sometimes because, as he says, he must consider the powers of his listeners and not overtax them. Or he must even take cognizance of his own strength and not drag the sermon out too long. These remarks admittedly savour of rhetoric, but they seem clearly to have been made on the spur of the moment.

Quamvis ergo, fratres, Psalmi plura restent consulendum est tamen viribus et animae et corporis propter varietatem audientium: quia et cum reficimur ex eodem tritico velut multi sapes nobis fiunt, ad detergenda fastidia: haec vobis sufficiant.²⁶

De quo latius dicerem, nisi sermo iam longior et meis senilibus viribus, et vestrae fortasse satietati parcere cogeret.²⁷

On the other hand Augustine sees fit at times to apologize for a short sermon. On one occasion he speaks scarcely more than three hundred words, and says "Let these few words suffice, as today I must speak to the children on the Sacraments of the altar."

Satis sint vobis pauca ista, quoniam et post laboraturi sumus, et de Sacramentis altaris hodie Infantibus disputandum est.²⁸

It was the custom on the feast day of a martyr to read the acts of that martyr before giving the sermon.²⁹ Accordingly on

²⁵ Tractate 5, on Gospel of John. Cf. also Tractate 8 on Gospel of John; Enarrat. 1 in Ps. 32, 12; Enarrat. 1, in Ps. 33, 11; 1, 5; 140, 6; 274, 1; 348, 4; 355, 7.

²⁶ Enarrat. 1 in Ps. 32.

²⁷ 348, 4.

²⁸ 226, 1. Cf. also 212, 2; 325, 2.

²⁹ Cf. Ferrarius, op. cit., 76.

the feast of Saint Vincent, Augustine delivers a very short sermon, explaining that they have been very patient listening to the deeds of the Saint and so should not be overburdened with a long discourse.

*Longam lectionem audivimus, brevis est dies: longo sermone etiam nos tenere vestram patientiam non debemus. Novimus quia patienter audistis, et diu stando et audiendo tanquam martyri compassi estis. Qui audit vos, amet vos, et coronet vos.*²⁰

On one occasion the character of the congregation causes Augustine to end his sermon betimes. He should consider many other matters, which have already been postponed, but he will put them off again and not burden his hearers or himself. "Furthermore," he says, "many perhaps have come here today to witness the ceremony and not to hear the homily. Tomorrow let only those come who wish to listen so that we may neither deprive the eager nor burden the disdainful."

*Quid ergo, fratres, quia illis et illis respondimus, nihil dicemus quid sibi velint hydriae, quid aqua in vinum conversa, quid architriclinus, quid sponsus, quid mater Iesu in mysterio, quid ipsae nuptiae? Dicenda sunt omnia, sed onerandi non estis. Volui quidem in nomine Christi et hesterno die, quo solet sermo deberi Charitati vestrae, id agere vobiscum, sed non sum permissus necessitatibus quibusdam impediens. Si ergo placet Sanctitati vestrae, hoc quod ad mysterium pertinet huius facti, in crastinum differamus, et non oneremus et vestram et nostram infirmitatem. Sunt forte hodie multi qui propter solemnitatem diei, non propter audiendum sermonem convenerunt. Crastino qui venient, veniant audituri; ut nec fraudemus studiosos, nec grave-mus fastidiosos.*²¹

Very frequently Augustine ends his sermon with some such sentiment as, "Time will not permit us to continue further, but we shall have to make the most of what we have heard."

*Ea quae sequuntur in Evangelio, non sunt temporis brevitate coarctanda. Et ideo sermo iste, charissimi, velut ovium sanctarum cibis, si sufficit, salubriter capiatur; si exiguus est, desiderabiliter ruminetur.*²²

Also in closing a sermon, Augustine may refer to the size or

²⁰ 274.

²¹ Tractate 8 on Gospel of John. Cf. also Tractate 5 on Epistle of John.

²² Tractate 59 on Gospel of John. Cf. also 4, 33; 51, 35; 259, 6; Enarrat. 3 in Ps. 32, 29.

character of his congregation and even request that they be present in greater numbers next time.

Aliquid enim pro salute ipsorum egimus in concilio, quod explicari vobis hodie iam tempus non sufficit. Unde exhortamur vos ut alacriores et numerosiores, (audient enim a vobis fratres nostri qui nunc non adsunt), conveniatis crastino die ad basilicam Tricliarum.²³

The frequent digressions in Augustine's sermons are a special mark of their informality and spontaneity. In one sermon he is particularly bothered by the thought of the number of Christians who are absent attending the pagan festival of that day. He mentions them continually, even at the very end of his discourse.

Et si aliquanto vos diutius tenuimus, consilii fuit ut importunae horae transirent, arbitramur iam illos (the merry-makers) peregrisse vanitatem suam. Nos autem, fratres, quando pasti sumus epulis salutaribus, quae restant agamus, ut diem dominicum solemniter impleamus in gaudiis spiritualibus, et comparemus gaudia veritatis cum gaudiis vanitatis: et si horremus, doleamus; si dolemus, oremus; si oramus, exaudiamur; si exaudimur, et illos lucratur.²⁴

Very frequently too the digressions are in the manner of short parenthetical explanations, after or within quotations from Scripture.

Quam sententiam confirmat; non solum Epistola quae scribitur ad Hebraeos, ubi dicitur, Si enim qui per Angelos dictus est sermo, factus est firmus (Hebr. 2, 2): (Loquebatur enim de veteri Testamento, commendavit quod ibi Angeli loquebantur; sed Deus in Angelis suis honorabatur, et per Angelos interior habitator audiebatur); sed etiam in Actibus Apostolorum Stephanus dicit, etc.²⁵

Very indicative of the spontaneous character of these sermons is the manner in which Augustine repeatedly stops in the middle of a sentence to make an explanation or even to reprove his audience, and then returns to take up his unfinished sentence again.

Sicut quando loquitur propheta (Christianis loquor, vel proficientibus in schola Dei; non sunt rudia nec nova quae dico, sed vestrae

²³ Enarrat. 3 in Ps. 32, 29. Cf. also 19, 6.

²⁴ Tractate 7 on Gospel of John, 24.

²⁵ 7, 6. Cf. also 62, 17; 82, 13; 89, 5; 96, 2; 181, 6.

Sanctitati nobiscum usitatissima et manifestissima), quando propheta loquitur, quid dicimus?³⁸

Superius quando ait, Venit hora, et nunc est; obsecro, intendite. Nostis, fratres, quia ad panem ventris cum labore pervenitur; quanto magis ad panem mentis? Cum labore statis, et auditis; sed nos cum maiore stamus, et loquimur. Si laboramus propter vos. collaborare non debetis propter eosdem vos? Superius ergo cum diceret, Venit hora, et adderet, et nunc est, quid subiecit?³⁹

Augustine sometimes repeats a statement entirely, in order to make it perfectly clear. Thus,

In omnibus enim Christianis, fratres intendite, aut per malos nascuntur boni, aut per bonos nascuntur mali, aut per bonos boni, aut per malos mali: amplius istis quatuor generibus non potestis invenire. Quare iterum repetam, advertite, retinete; excutite corda vestra, nolite pigri esse: capite, ne capiamini, quomodo quatuor genera sunt omnium Christianorum. Aut per bonos nascuntur boni, aut per malos nascuntur mali, aut per bonos mali, aut per malos boni. Puto quia planum est.⁴⁰

The free and easy conduct of the congregations of this period is well known generally. The church besides being a place for common worship was also the regular place to visit and meet friends. Talking and laughing were indulged in freely, and conduct was in general unrestrained. Just before the reading of the gospel, it was the regular custom for the deacon to demand silence, and just before the giving of the sermon the preacher himself usually asked for quiet and strict attention.³⁹ During the sermon when a preacher came to an important or abstruse point, he would regularly ask for special attention; but often whispering and talking would break out, especially when the sermon was extra long and dull, whereupon the preacher would be obliged to stop and demand silence in no uncertain tones. The ordinary method of requesting attention is by some hortatory form of *attendo*, *intendo*, *video*, or *audio*.⁴⁰ Very frequently, however, it requires more than a single word to bring

³⁸ 2, 5. Cf. also 155, 14; 266, 7; 278, 8.

³⁹ Tractate 19 on Gospel of John, 17. Cf. also 37, 7; 140, 6; 292, 6; Tractate 1 on Epistle of John, 13.

⁴⁰ Tractate 11 on Gospel of John, 8.

³⁹ Cf. Ferrarius, op. cit., 49, 56, 58.

⁴⁰ Passim.

his audience to a proper degree of attentiveness, and thus arise such spontaneous outbursts as:

Videte, obsecro vos, et moveat vos, quomodo et nos, moveat, si fieri potest.⁴¹

Quale illud corpus erat, quod Dominus per claustra traiecit? Intendite, obsecro, si possim adiuvante Domino qualibuscumque verbis expectationi vestrae aut satisfacere, aut non multum deesse.⁴²

Quid est ergo, Visu vestro videbatis? Intendat Sanctitas vestra quod dico, intendat in orationem plus quam in me; ut intelligatis quod dicimus, ut et nos ita dicamus quemadmodum vos oportet audire et intelligere quod auditis.⁴³

Attende et quod sequitur: quaecumque enim facit Pater, eadem et Filius facit: non dixit, Talia. Paululum attendat Charitas vestra, ne vobismetipsis strepitum faciat. Tranquillo corde opus est, pia et devota fide, intentione religiosa: non in me vasculum, sed in illum attendite qui panem ponit in vasculo. Attendite ergo paululum.⁴⁴

Very often Augustine feels obliged to recognize applause, and even to take cognizance of signs of disapproval, all of which must necessarily be of the moment. He usually recognizes applause in a very matter-of-fact way, as "There, your applause assures me that my explanation is clear."

Fratres mei, unde clamatis, unde exsultatis, unde amatis, nisi, quia ibi est scintilla huius charitatis? Quid desideratis, rogo vos? Videri potest oculis? tangi potest? pulchritudo aliqua est quae oculos delectat?⁴⁵

Audi apostolum Paulum; nam ipsam exauditionem ad salutem ostendit illi Deus: Sufficit tibi, inquit, gratia mea; nam virtus in infirmitate perficitur. Rogasti, clamasti, ter clamasti: ipsum semel quod clamasti audiavi, non averti aures meas a te; novi quid faciam: tu vis auferri medicamentum quo ureris; ego novi infirmitatem qua gravaris.⁴⁶

Unde omnes acclamastis, nisi quia omnes agnovistis.⁴⁷

There are many indications of the care with which Augustine watched the effect of his words upon the congregation. Now he sees that the audience has grasped his meaning, and he may

⁴¹ 265, 7.

⁴² 277, 8.

⁴³ 362, 11. Cf. also 52, 8; 180, 7; 277, 8; 294, 19; Tractate 11 on Gospel of John, 8; Tractate 5 on Epistle of John, 13.

⁴⁴ 126, 8.

⁴⁵ Tractate 3 on Gospel of John, 21.

⁴⁶ Tractate 6 on Epistle of John, 7.

⁴⁷ 151, 8. Cf. also 21, 5; 96, 4; 121, 3; 131, 5; 299, 9; 302, 7.

either end his sermon or go on to the next point. Now he notices that many have not understood, and he must explain again.

Nunc autem video vos et attentione audiendi, et celeritate intelligendi, non solum percepisse dictum, sed praevolasse dicturum: Gratias Domino.⁴⁸

Video vos cito intellexisse, nec tamen debeo iam finire. Non enim omnes cito intellexistis. Vidi in voce intelligentes, plures video silentio requirentes.⁴⁹

Paucos intellexisse video, plures non intellexisse, quos ego nequaquam tacendo fraudabo.⁵⁰

On one occasion Augustine notices talking among his congregation. He says, "I have no doubt but that many of you have understood, but I judge from the talking that those who have understood are trying to explain the matter to those who failed to grasp it. Accordingly I will speak more plainly that you all may understand."

Iam multos vestrum intellexisse non dubito. Non video, sed ex colloctione, quia loquimini ad alterutrum, sentio eos qui intellexerunt, velle exponere iis qui nondum intellexerunt. Ergo planius aliquanto dicam, ut ad omnes perveniat.⁵¹

In several cases the sermons of Augustine are confessedly extempore in the strict sense of the word. Sometimes Augustine would be inspired with the subject of his sermon while the *lector* was reading the Scriptures.

Vox poenitentis agnoscitur in verbis quibus psallenti respondimus: Averte faciem tuam a peccatis meis, et omnes iniquitates meas dele (Psal. 50, 11). Unde cum sermonem ad vestram Charitatem non praepararemus, hinc nobis esse tractandum Domino imperante cognovimus. Volebamus enim hodierna die vos in ruminatione permittere, scientes quam abundantes epulas ceperitis. Sed quia salubriter quod apponitur accipitis, quotidie multum esuritis. Praestet ergo Dominus ipse Deus noster, et nobis virium sufficientiam, et vobis utilem audientiam. Neque enim ignoramus, esse serviendum bonae vestrae et utili voluntati. Adiuvemur ergo a vobis et voto et studio; voto ad Deum, studio ad verbum; ut ea dicamus quae vobis esse utilia ipse iudicat, qui vos pascit per nos. Vox igitur in his verbis poenitentis agnoscitur:

⁴⁸ 52, 20.

⁴⁹ 101, 9.

⁵⁰ 131, 9. Cf. also 57, 11; 164, 2; 315, 10; 362, 29.

⁵¹ 23, 8. Cf. also 24, 5.

Averte faciem tuam a peccatis meis, et omnia facinora mea dele. Proinde aliquid de poenitentia dicere divinitus iubemur. Neque enim nos istum psalmum cantandum lectori imperavimus: sed quod ille censuit vobis esse utile ad audiendum, hoc cordi etiam puerili imperavit. Dicamus aliquid de utilitate poenitentiae: praesertim, quia et dies iam sanctus anniversarius imminet, quo propinquante humiliari animas et domari corpora studiosius decet.³⁵²

Similarly on another occasion when Augustine is preaching on John 7, 2-12, according to which, Jesus, after bidding His brethren go up to the festival day, says that He Himself will not go up, because His time is not yet accomplished, and yet afterwards does go up, not openly but in secret. Several questions, Augustine says, arise from this text; among others, Is there any difference between deceiving and lying? Is it right to deceive sometimes? etc. All of these, however, he will put off to discuss the question which came to him as the Gospel was being read, Could Christ lie? or Could Truth say anything false?

Sed ait qui me audit: Numquid hoc potes de Christo dicere, quia vel non potuit implere quae volebat, vel futura nesciebat? Bene agis, bene suggeris, recte communes: sed, o homo, partire mecum sollicitudinem. Quem non audemus dicere minus valentem, audemus dicere mentientem? Ego quidem, quantum existimo, quantum pro mea infirmitate iudicare possum, eligo ut homo in aliquo fallatur, quam ut in aliquo mentiatur. Falli enim pertinet ad infirmitatem, mentiri ad iniquitatem. Odisti, inquit, Domine, omnes qui operantur iniquitatem. Et continuo: Perdes omnes qui loquuntur mendacium (Ps. 5, 7). Aut tantumdem valet iniquitas et mendacium; aut plus est Perdes, quam Odisti. Neque enim qui odio habetur, continuo perditione punitur. Verum sit illa quaestio, utrum aliquando mentiri necesse sit: non enim modo discussio: latebrosa est, multos sinus habet; non vacat omnes secare, et ad vivum pervenire. Ergo eius curatio in tempus aliud differatur: fortassis enim sine sermone nostro divina opitulatione sanabitur. Sed quid distuli, quid volo hodie tractare, intendite et distinguite. An aliquando mentiendum sit, hanc dixi difficilem et latebrosissimam quaestionem, hanc differo. Utrum autem Christus mentitus sit, utrum Veritas aliquid falsum dixerit, hoc hodie suscepimus admoniti ex evangelica lectione.³⁵³

Possidius tells us of another occasion when Augustine confessed that he had lost the thread of his proposed discourse, and had proceeded with another subject to the end. He says, "I

³⁵² 352, 1. Cf. also 9, 7; 52, 1; 71, 8; 180, 4.

³⁵³ 133, 3.

know also, and not I only but also my other brethren and fellow servants who were at that time living together with the holy man in the church at Hippo, that when we were seated at the table he (Augustine) said, 'Did you take notice of my sermon in the church today, that both the beginning and end worked out contrary to my usual custom? For I did not explain to its conclusion the subject which I had proposed but left it in suspense.' To which we replied, 'Yes, we know it and remember that we wondered at it at the time.' Then he said, 'I suppose that perhaps the Lord wished some wanderer among the people to be taught and healed by our forgetfulness and error, for in His hands are we and all our utterances. For while I was investigating the margins of the question proposed, by a digression of speech I passed over to something else and so, without finishing or explaining the question, I ended my discourse by attacking the error of the Manichaeans, about which I had intended to say nothing in my discussion, rather than by speaking about those things which I had intended to explain.'"⁵⁴

In his own works Augustine relates two very striking instances of the spirit in which he labored to produce a certain deep effect in his hearers, and how on achieving his purpose he ceased speaking at once. In the *De Doctrina Christiana*,⁵⁵ Augustine in talking of the majestic style says, "The majestic style, on the other hand, frequently silences the audience by its impressiveness, but calls forth their tears. For example, when at Caesaria in Mauritania, I was dissuading the people from that civil, or worse than civil, war which they called Caterva (for it was not fellow-citizens merely, but neighbors, brothers, fathers, and sons even, who, divided into two factions and armed with stones, fought annually at a certain season of the year for several days continually, everyone killing whomsoever he could), I strove with all the vehemence of speech that I could command to root out and drive from their hearts and lives an evil so cruel and inveterate; it was not however when I heard their applause, but when I saw their tears, that I thought I had produced an effect. For the applause showed that they were subdued. And when I saw their tears I was confident, even before the event proved it, that this horrible and barbarous custom (which had

⁵⁴ Vita, 15.

⁵⁵ 4, 24.

been handed down to them from their fathers and their ancestors of generations long gone by and which like an enemy was besieging their hearts, or rather had complete possession of them) was overthrown, and immediately that my sermon was finished I called upon them with heart and voice to give praise and thanks to God."

In a letter to Olympius, Bishop of Tagaste,⁵⁶ Augustine speaks of a similar incident. "While I addressed them and made my complaints, God, our Defender and Guide, seemed to impart to me courage and strength, according to the magnitude of the danger and enterprise. I did not move their tears by mine; but when I had ended speaking, I confess, that, anticipated by their weeping, I was unable to abstain. Having then wept together for a while, with strong expectations of their amendment, I brought my address to a close."

Thus then as we read over Augustine's sermons and find such liveliness, much spontaneity, and so many passages which could only have been delivered under the impulse of the moment, we are necessarily led to believe that his sermons were delivered extempore for the most part, or at least after a certain amount of forethought but never with any written assistance. And furthermore we find Augustine himself giving us two striking examples of his manner of preaching, which entirely confirm the belief. That Augustine made a very extensive use of *notarii* within the church and in the privacy of his own study has already been set forth, and this entirely harmonizes with the characteristics of the sermons as we see them today.

The sermons were delivered without written assistance, entirely extempore or largely so. *Notarii* in the church took them down in shorthand as they were being delivered. The sermons as we have them today are copies of the longhand transcripts of the notes of the *notarii*. This explains the vigor, the conversational tone, and the many irregularities which are to be found in Augustine's discourses.

⁵⁶ Vol. 2, 37 ff.

VIII. OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF AUGUSTINE'S SERMONS WHICH SHOW THEM TO BE NOT ONLY EXTEMPORE, BUT TO HAVE BEEN LEFT UNREVISED.

Many of the passages already alluded to in the previous chapter as proofs of extemporization indicate likewise that Augustine's sermons received little or no revision; for there are irregularities in them which would naturally have been smoothed out or omitted under revision. Thus we should have expected such passages to be emended as those in which Augustine gropes around for the exact words to fit his thoughts; or those which display irritability when he declaims against his critics or chides his congregation; or those which contain long digressions, or sentences interrupted for a momentary cause and then taken up anew from the very beginning, etc.

Yet there are still other indications of the unfinished state of Augustine's sermons. Augustine is continually referring to the time. Either he has a great deal to say, and warns his congregation that he must have undivided attention from the start, or nearing the end, he finds that he has still much to say but lacks the time within which to say it.¹ The natural inference is that the sermon had a definite period allotted to it, traditionally or otherwise, which was not to be exceeded. This seems especially true since we find the same complaint among many other preachers of this same general period; e. g. Origen, homily 2 in Genesim, homily 21 in Numeros; Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis 13; and Petrus Chrysologus, Catechesis 121.²

The time usually allotted a sermon seems to have been an (Roman) hour, *hora*. Thus we read in Chrysologus:³

Date ergo veniam, fratres, si intra punctum temporis et horae unius vix momentum obscura lucidare, clausa reserare, firmare dubia, profunda contingere, tot saeculorum ineffabile sacramentum per omnem modum aperire non possum, et eloqui, si vel caute aemulis, secure filiis, credentibus confiderenter, constanter incredulis non valemus.

¹ See previous chapter.

² Cf. Ferrarius, op. cit. 156; Migne P. L. 52, 508, note d.

³ Sermo 112. In this passage, it is manifestly impossible to take *horae* as an indefinite period of time, because it is made definite by the *unius*, and the indefinite idea has already been expressed in the previous *punctum temporis*. Cf. also Cyril Cat. 13, 37; Cat. 13, 13; Cat. 14, 27.

Similarly in Augustine we find:

Semper in sermonibus, quos ad populos habui, huius quaestionis difficultatem, molestiamque vitavi; non quia nihil haberem, quod inde utcumque cogitarem; neque enim in re tanta quaerere, petere, pulsare negligerem, sed quia ipsi intelligentiae, quae mihi aliquantum aperiebatur, verbis ad horam occurrentibus me posse sufficere non putarem.*

Hodierno die iam ecce tertio audivimus ex Evangelio Domini nostri resurrectionem. Quantum existimo, responsum est illis, sicut intelligere potestis: sicut et nos loqui possumus, quantum hora sermonis permittit.*

As we all know, the Roman day was divided into twelve hours (*horae*), each being one-twelfth of the time between sunrise and sunset and varying therefore according to the season of the year; varying in our own time from 44 minutes and 30 seconds to 1 hour 10 minutes and 50 seconds. Few of Augustine's discourses, however, as we have them today would take even the shortest Roman hour for delivery. Augustine, as we have seen, laid down the principle that a speaker should watch his audience, and, once it is evident that he has made his point clear, should pass on to the next step, or end his sermon as the case may be. We have also seen Augustine ending his sermon for various other reasons, personal fatigue, pressure of other duties, the continued inattention of his congregation, etc. Yet all these facts will not account for the brevity of the majority of the sermons. The discrepancy between the length of time allowed for the delivery and the brevity of most of Augustine's discourses must be accounted for in other ways.

The general irregular character of Augustine's sermons is well known and indeed has called forth such bitter criticisms as the following: "Few religious discourses are to be found which contain so many imperfections. There is no want in them indeed of subtleties and playful wit. Extremely deficient, however, are they in respect to thoroughness of investigation, appropriateness of illustration, a useful treatment of subjects, a correct interpretation of the Holy Scripture, and an easy and agreeable style and manner of address."† Most of these supposed deficiencies may be explained easily from a knowledge of the

* Sermo 11 de verbis Domini in Evangelium Matthaei.

† Sermo 143 de Tempore.

‡ Schmid (see Am. Bibl. Rep. 7, 375).

circumstances under which the discourses were given. They were delivered in most cases to the common people by a preacher who spoke with a varying degree of preparation, often strictly extempore and never with any help from writing. The preacher also spoke with eye fixed steadfastly on his listeners, directing the procedure of his discourse according to the effect of his words as he perceived it. *Notarii* in the church followed the speaker taking down his words, and in all probability failed to record much of importance, as they endeavored to keep pace with the eloquent and rapid preacher.⁷ To this may be due not only the faults just mentioned, but also the brevity of most of the sermons as noted above.

In several sermons we seem to have actual insertions made by the *notarius* himself. It seems to have been the custom at this time to bring certain objects into the church and exhibit them to the people at the proper moment during the sermon in order to rouse and even to stir the audience to tears.⁸ Such a practice was followed by the pagan orators, and seems to have been taken over by the early Christian Fathers.⁹ Augustine on one occasion exhibited a young man miraculously cured by Saint Stephen;¹⁰ and at still another time presented witnesses of the miracle about which he was then discoursing.¹¹ Occasionally, too, Augustine recited—but not always to the best advantage—accounts of miracles, which he memorized from the official records.¹²

Thus in one sermon given in honor of St. Stephen,¹³ Augustine starts to tell of a miracle performed by the Saint at Uzalis, saying—

Apud Uzalim ubi est episcopus frater meus Evodius, quanta miracula ibi fiant quaerite, et invenietis. Praetermissis autem aliis, indico vobis unum quod ibi factum est, ut videatis quanta sit ibi praesentia maiestatis. Mulier quaedam subito aegrotum filium, cui succurrere festinando

⁷ Cf. Pease, Notes on St. Jerome's Tractates *On the Psalms*, Journal of Biblical Literature, 116-131; 26, 1907.

⁸ Cf. Ferrarius, op. cit. 145.

⁹ Cf. Quintilian 6, 1.

¹⁰ 320, 1.

¹¹ 322, 1. Cf. Nourry, Le Miracle d'après St. Aug., Annales de la philosophie chrét. 1903, 375-386.

¹² 286, 7.

¹³ 323, 3.

non potuit, in gremio suo catechumenum amisit: quae clamans, Mortuus est, inquit, filius meus catechumenus.

Then we read the following, the first part of which was obviously not written by Augustine:

Et cum haec diceret Augustinus, populus de memoria sancti Stephani clamare coepit, Deo gratias! Christo laudes! In quo continuo clamore, puella quae curata est ad absidam perducta est. Qua visa populus cum gaudio et fletu, nullis interpositis sermonibus, sed solo strepitu interposito, aliquandiu clamorem protraxit: et silentio facto, Augustinus episcopus dixit, Scriptum est in Psalmo, Dixi, Proloquar adversum me delictum meum Domino Deo meo, et tu dimisisti impietatem cordis mei. Dixi, Proloquar: nondum prolocutus sum: Dixi, Proloquar, et tu dimisisti. Commendavi istam miseram, imo ex misera, commendavi eam vestris orationibus. Disposuimus orare, et exauditi sumus. Sit gaudium nostrum actio gratiarum. Citius exaudita est mater Ecclesia, quam in perniciem maledicta mater illa.

Thus is the discourse ended. The beginning of the last section is clearly an integral part of the sermon as transmitted to us, but it is evidently not Augustine's own remark but that of the *notarius*. Apparently Augustine was forced to stop his discourse on account of the cries of joy, and when silence returned he saw fit merely to finish his account of the miracle and to omit the sermon proper. In fact he himself tells us in the beginning of the next sermon, that he will take up on this day the homily that was interrupted and ended so suddenly on the day before by the exclamations of joy at the recounting of a miracle.

Debet a nobis hesternus sermo compleri, qui maiori interruptus est gaudio. Statueram enim et coeperam loqui Charitati vestrae, quare mihi videntur isti fratres divina auctoritate ad hanc civitatem esse directi, ut hic in eis diu optata et exspectata sanitas impleretur. Et hoc volens dicere, prius commendare coeperam Charitati vestrae loca sancta, in quibus non sunt sanati, et ad nos inde sunt directi. Et dixi de Ancona civitate Italiae: coeperam de Uzali civitate dicere, quae est in Africa (episcopum habet fratrem meum, nostis, Evodium); quia et ad illam civitatem eos venire, fama eiusdem martyris et operum eius compulisset. Non est illic datum quod dari potuit, ut hic daretur ubi dari debuit. Cum autem opera divina per sanctum Martyrem commemorare breviter vellem, omissis caeteris, unum institueram dicere: quod cum dico, restituta illi puellae sanitate, subito laetitiae tumultus exortus est, et nos aliter compulsi finire sermonem.³⁴

³⁴ 324, 31. Cf. also Enarrat. 2 in Ps. 36, 19 and 20.

It was the custom among the early Fathers of the Church to begin and end their sermons with a short prayer.¹⁵ Comparatively few of Augustine's sermons have a prayer at the beginning and this in spite of the fact that Augustine himself says in speaking of the Christian orator, "And when the hour is come that he must speak, he ought, before he opens his mouth, to lift up his thirsty soul to God to drink in what he is about to pour forth, and to be himself filled with what he is about to distribute."¹⁶

At the end of a discourse, when the prayer is quoted in full, we usually find—

Conversi ad Dominum Deum Patrem omnipotentem, puro corde ei, quantum potest parvitas nostra, maximas atque uberes gratias agamus; precantes toto animo singularem mansuetudinem eius, ut preces nostras in beneplacito suo exaudire dignetur, inimicum a nostris actibus et cogitationibus sua virtute expellat, nobis multiplicet fidem, gubernet mentem, spirituales cogitationes concedat, et ad beatitudinem suam perducat, per Iesum Christum Filium eius. Amen.¹⁷

Usually, however, only the brief exhortation leading to the concluding prayer is given, such as *Conversi ad Dominum*, etc.,¹⁸ and often we find nothing at all.

All of these irregularities may be due to the *notarius*, who did not see fit, in every case, to take down the usual opening and closing prayer, since, after all, these prayers did not form an integral part of the discourses. Often, too, merely an indication of the prayer, such as quoting the first few words, was considered sufficient. Any one familiar with Augustine's discourses could easily supply the rest. Furthermore, all inconsistencies of reporting, hitherto mentioned, are such as would probably have been corrected, if the sermons had received any serious attention after they had been transcribed from the shorthand reports. That Augustine did not revise his sermons, he himself, as well as his pupil Possidius, tells us.

Possidius remarks¹⁹ that Augustine set out to revise all his works shortly before his death and that he embodied his re-

¹⁵ Cf. Ferrarius, op. cit., 38 and 154.

¹⁶ *De Doctrina Christiana*, 4, 32. Cf. also the beginning of the following sermons: 71, 124, 133, 154, 164, 242.

¹⁷ 67, end. Cf. also end of following sermons: 34, 100, 141, 183.

¹⁸ 49, 63, 69, 76, 87, 153, 156, 182, etc.

¹⁹ *Vita*, 28.

vision in two books, known as the *Retractations*, and then he adds—

Praereptos etiam sibi quosdam libros ante diligentiolem emendationem a nonnullis fratribus conquerebatur. Imperfecta etiam quaedam suorum librorum praeventus morte dereliquit.

Finally, Augustine himself makes a very conclusive statement in the very last sentence of his *Retractations*, a passage which we have discussed before, but which deserves a second notice here.²⁰

Haec opera nonaginta tria in libris ducentis triginta duobus me dictasse recolui, quando haec retractavi, utrum adhuc essem aliquos dictaturus ignorans atque ipsam eorum retractationem in libris duobus edidi, urgentibus fratribus, antequam epistulas ac sermones ad populum, alias dictatas, alios a me dictos retractare coepissem.

IX. CONCLUSION.

The generally accepted view regarding the manner in which Augustine composed and delivered his sermons was, as we have seen, to the general effect that he wrote out most of his sermons before he delivered them, that he dictated many to be read to his congregation thereafter, and that he delivered comparatively few extempore. This view was based chiefly on the last sentence of the *Retractations* as given by the Benedictine editors and their immediate successors. The latest editor of the *Retractations* (Knoll), however, gives a reading based on sound textual criticism, which entirely does away with any idea of Augustine's having written his sermons before delivering them. The only other evidence in support of the old view was two statements, neither bearing directly on the point, but each by a forced interpretation rendering apparent corroborative testimony. No direct evidence whatsoever exists to show that Augustine ever preached with any written assistance.

Taking up the entire subject anew, we undertook a hurried glance at the manner in which some of the contemporaneous and nearly contemporaneous preachers prepared and delivered sermons, and we found a varied practice among them. Some read the sermons prepared and written out by others; some wrote out their sermons beforehand and then read them; and others

* Cf. Introduction.

preached without written preparation. The preachers of the highest reputation, however, such as Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Pope Faustus, and Jerome, all spoke without written preparation of any kind.

When these great speakers spoke in this manner, they regularly had shorthand experts present in the churches to take down their words. Afterwards the shorthand copies, if so desired, were transcribed, and were revised, usually by the preacher himself, and then sent out to the public.

An abundance of evidence was at hand to show that Augustine, perhaps the greatest preacher of them all, also delivered his sermons without any written assistance. Augustine himself tells us that he usually thought over his subject beforehand, and then adapted his delivery of the sermon to the reaction produced on the congregation by his words. Yet many definite cases were also at hand where, for one reason or another, Augustine changed his subject and spoke extemporaneously in the strictest sense of the word.

Augustine, too, had the assistance of shorthand writers in every phase of his literary activity, and, just as in the case of his eloquent contemporaries, these *notarii* were present in the church and took down Augustine's words as he spoke.

The fact that Augustine's sermons are a disappointing field for the study of the *lingua rustica* cannot be used as an argument against the delivery of the sermons as just mentioned, because the gap between the literary and the ordinary colloquial language at this time was not so great as is usually believed. It was unnecessary for Augustine to descend deeply into the *sermo plebeius*, which was still of too low repute to be admitted haphazardly in any work pretending to the slightest literary merit.

On examining the sermons themselves, evidence appeared on every side to substantiate the belief that they were delivered without written preparation, often extemporaneously. To review but a few of the more striking features, Augustine sometimes was at a loss for the right words to express his thoughts, and we see him groping around in a vain effort to hit upon the proper expression. The time allotted for his sermons was a constant source of worry, and he again and again complains that he must hurry on in order to finish in due season. On finishing

a sermon, Augustine is frequently dissatisfied: the time was not sufficient to treat his subject properly; he has said a great deal and although he has much more to say, he will not overburden their minds; his audience has been very restless, so that they had better go home and rest, and return next time with a better disposition, etc. On a great many occasions incidents occurred during the sermon which caused Augustine to interrupt his discourse: the size of the audience in spite of the inclement weather pleases the preacher on one occasion; then again, the congregation is small, many having been enticed away by the pleasures of a pagan festival; the audience often does not grasp the point, and this causes Augustine to stop just after he has started on a new tack to go back and explain anew; Augustine often recognizes the applause of his hearers, and even rarely takes notice of their cries of disapproval; the stupidity of the audience frequently causes Augustine to stop his sermon suddenly, and rebuke them again and again with considerable persistency; and finally, Augustine sometimes says that he has been inspired to change the subject which he had intended to speak about, and states that he is discoursing without preparation.

Interspersed among several of the sermons we noticed certain remarks about the audience and the preacher which obviously were not from Augustine himself. The natural conclusion was that they were from the hand of the *notarii*.

The irregular and unfinished character of the sermons in general led us to believe that, after they were transcribed into longhand, they were probably never revised by anyone, not to mention the author himself. Complete corroboration of this was found, not only in Possidius, but also in Augustine, who expressly states in the *Retractations*, that he has revised all his works except the letters and sermons, and we know that he died shortly after he made this statement.

As was said before, it is futile to argue that the sermons may have been written by Augustine after he delivered them. If this were the case, his discourses would vary slightly from sermons carefully prepared before delivery. They would lack all of the marks of spontaneity and immediate inspiration mentioned just above, and moreover, would exist today as more polished and finished works.

II.—DIE ENTSTEHUNG DES ABSOLUTEN INFINITIVS IM GRIECHISCHEN.

Der Gebrauch des sogenannten absoluten Infinitivs im Griechischen beschränkt sich bekannterweise bloss auf einige formelhafte Infinitivkonstruktionen. Für die Erklärung dieser eigentümlichen Ausdrucksformen wurde bisher die ihnen zugeschriebene limitative oder konsekutive Bedeutung zugrunde gelegt. Nach der von *Grünenwald* (*Der freie formelhafte Infinitiv der Limitation im Griechischen*, Würzburg 1888) angebahnten und jetzt allgemein herrschenden Ansicht (*Brugmann-Thumb Gr. Gr.*⁴ 595) haben wir es mit *limitativen*, nach der auf *G. Hermann* (*Opuscula*, Leipzig 1827 vol. I. p. 227) zurückgehenden Meinung mit *konsekutiven* Infinitiven zu tun.

Meines Erachtens ist die erste Erklärungsweise annehmbar trotz *Stahls* (*Krit.-hist. Synt. d. gr. Verb.* Heidelberg 1907, 501, 2 u. 607, 3) diesbezüglicher Auffassung. Er meint die infinitivische Ausdrucksform sei bedingt durch die ihr anhaftende konsekutive Bedeutung. Ja, ein konsekutiver Gedanke kann allerdings durch den Infinitiv ausgedrückt werden, allein nicht jeder konsekutive Gedanke erscheint in dieser Sprachform. Bekanntlich wird der Infinitiv nur zur Bezeichnung einer *innern* Folge verwendet, d. i. nach *Stahls* Terminologie nur in synthetischen Folgesätzen (492, 2). Wie aber beispielsweise ein *ὡς εἰπεῖν* oder *ὡς εἰκάσαι* mit dem übergeordneten Satz so eng verbunden sei, dass es einen synthetischen Folgesatz bezeichnen könne, ist nicht einzusehen. Hängen doch derartige Redeweisen mit dem übergeordneten Satz so lose zusammen, dass sie bloss eine äussere Folge, d. i. "ein für sich bestehendes Ergebnis" bezeichnen können. In diesem Falle wäre ein Folgesatz mit dem verbum finitum auf dem Platze.

Also *Stahls* Theorie ist meiner Ansicht nach zu verwerfen. Richtiger ist die Annahme einer limitativen Bedeutung. Dies gibt auch *Stahl* zu, indem er behauptet, dass die durch die fraglichen Sprachformen "bestimmte Aussage nur eine gewisse relative Geltung hat, wodurch eine Art einschränkender Bedeutung entsteht." Wir haben es also mit Aussagen zu tun,

die ursprünglich eine *einschränkende* Bedeutung hatten. Auffallend ist der Sprachgebrauch, wonach ein einschränkender Gedanke, der sonst in der Form eines Nebensatzes mit entsprechendem verbum finitum erscheint, hier durch den Infinitiv ausgedrückt wird.

Angesichts dieser Tatsache erhebt sich die Frage, was wohl die Ursache dieser sprachlichen Sondererscheinung sein mag. Die ihr zugeschriebene limitative Funktion ist es sicherlich nicht. Die Erkenntnis der Funktion eines Ausdruckes ist bei weitem keine Erklärung seines sprachlichen Ursprunges. Dieser kann nur auf sprachlichem Wege ergründet werden. Es tritt somit folgende Frage an uns heran. Kann im Griechischen eine solche sprachliche Verbindung nachgewiesen oder rekonstruiert werden, aus welcher der absolute Infinitiv hervorgegangen sein mag?

Es ist eine eigentümliche Erscheinung, dass die Aussagen *ὡς εἰκάσαι*, *ὡς ἀκούσαι*, *ὡς εἰδέναι*, *ὡς* od. *ὅσον ἰδεῖν*, *ὡς εἰπεῖν* durch den blossen, alleinstehenden Infinitiv bezeichnet werden, da doch nach dem allgemeinen Sprachgebrauch der Infinitiv nur mit einem verbum finitum zusammen zum Ausdrucke des Prädikatsbegriffes verwendet wird. Dem scheint der Gebrauch des imperativischen Infinitivs zu widersprechen, der bekannterweise ohne verbum finitum gebraucht wird. Allein auch dieser Infinitiv diene ursprünglich zur Ergänzung eines verbum finitum, das aber "nicht ausgesprochen, sondern nur hinzuempfunden wurde" (Delbrück, Grundr.² 2, 339 u. Brugmann-Thumb, Gr. Gr.⁴ 594). Man kann somit kaum fehlgehen, wenn man annimmt, dass auch der absolute Infinitiv ursprünglich zur Ergänzung der Satzaussage diene.

Den oben erwähnten Ausdrucksformen entsprechen in den übrigen indog. Sprachen Infinitive verbunden mit einem verbum finitum, das den Charakter eines sogenannten Hilfszeitwortes hat. So heisst z. B. *ὡς εἰκάσαι* ursprünglich 'soweit man *vermuten kann*,' lat. quantum (ut) *conici potest* od. quantum (ut) *conicere licet*; *ὡς εἰπεῖν* ursprünglich 'soweit man *sagen kann*' od. 'soweit es sich *sagen lässt*,' lat. ursprünglich nicht ut ita dicam, sondern quantum (ut) *dici potest*. Vgl. ai. yac chrōtum śahyam = soweit zu hören *möglich* (ist) = *ὡς ἀκούσαι*.¹

¹ Der griechischen Ausdrucksweise steht am nächsten eigentümlicher-

Wie ersichtlich, erscheinen die den griechischen entsprechenden Infinitive sonst in Verbindung mit einem *verbum valendi*. Somit ist es nicht unwahrscheinlich, dass dieselbe Spracherscheinung ursprünglich auch im Griechischen vorhanden war.

Die angeführten Infinitivkonstruktionen sind also dem Sinne nach gleichbedeutend mit *subjektlosen einschränkenden Urteilsätzen die ein Können oder eine Möglichkeit bezeichnen*. Den Prädikatsbegriff derartiger Aussagen bezeichnet ein durch den Infinitiv ergänztes *verbum valendi*. Bei dem oft wiederkehrenden Gebrauch dieser Ausdrucksweise ist es natürlich, dass die erwähnten Infinitive als Ergänzung des *ἔστι*, seltener des gleichbedeutenden *πάρεστι* auftreten. So z. B. Aesch. Pr. 1055 *ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι*, Aesch. Sept. 923 *πάρεστι δ' εἰπεῖν*, Plat. Gorg. 524 c *ἔστιν ἰδεῖν*, Theaet. 201 b *ἔστιν εἰδέναι*.

Auffallender und hinsichtlich ihres Wesens beachtenswerter sind Verbindungen wie Aesch. Ch. 977 *ὥς ἐπικάσαι πάρεστιν*, Pers. 726 *ὥς ἰδεῖν πάρεστιν*, dann folgende auf die Vergangenheit Bezug nehmende Aussagen: Thuk. VIII 46, 5 *ὅσα γε ἀπὸ τῶν ποιουμένων ἦν εἰκάσαι* u. Aeschin. 2, 34 *ὥς ἦν ὑστερον ἀκοῦσαι*.

Auf Grund dieser Belege lässt sich folgende Tatsache feststellen. Die angeführten Infinitive, welche sonst als absolute Infinitive gebraucht werden, treten auch in einschränkenden Urteilssätzen auf, die mit *ὥς*, *ὅσον* (*ὅσα*) eingeleitet werden. Das *verbum valendi* ist mit Bezug auf die Gegenwart *πάρεστι*, mit Bezug auf die Vergangenheit das einfache *ἦν*. Das einfache *ἔστι* findet sich scheinbar nicht vor. Allein in Anbetracht dessen, dass *πάρεστι* als *verbum valendi*, im Vergleich zu dem gleichbedeutenden *ἔστι*, nur selten, zum grössten Teil in der Dichtersprache üblich ist, kann man kaum fehlen, wenn man annimmt, dass die mit *ὥς*, *ὅσον* (*ὅσα*) eingeleiteten Infinitive in Aussagen auf die Gegenwart bezogen auch mit *ἔστι* verbunden verwendet werden konnten. Dafür spricht das früher erwähnte *ὅσα γε . . . ἦν εἰκάσαι* u. *ὥς ἦν . . . ἀκοῦσαι*. Wenn also diese Redewendungen möglich waren, warum sollten dann solche Ausdrucksweisen wie *ὥς ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι* u. *ὥς (ὅς) ἔστιν εἰκάσαι* unmöglich gewesen sein?

weise die ungarische. So lautet *ὥς εἰκάσαι*, 'amennyire gyanitani' (wörtlich: soweit vermuten). Daneben ist gebräuchlich 'amennyire gyanitani lehet' (wörtlich: soweit vermuten kann).

Übrigens ist es hinsichtlich der Feststellung des Ergebnisses meiner Untersuchung ziemlich belanglos, ob das ursprüngliche *verbum valendi* *ἔστι* od. *πάρεστι* war. Die Hauptsache ist die Tatsache, dass die fraglichen Infinitive mit *ὥς* zur Ergänzung eines *verbum valendi* verwendet werden konnten. Dafür spricht ausser dem Gesagten meines Erachtens noch folgender Umstand. In dem Ausdrucke *ὥς συνελόντι εἰπεῖν* ist die syntaktische Zugehörigkeit des Dativs *συνελόντι* nicht gar so leicht zu verstehen. Dass er nicht von *εἰπεῖν* abhängen könne, liegt auf der Hand. Seine Zugehörigkeit erklären meiner Ansicht nach ähnliche Dative, wie Hom. ο 393 *ἔστι δὲ τερπομένοισιν ἀκοῦειν*, Soph. Ai. 1418 *πολλὰ βροτοῖς ἔστιν ἰδοῦσι γινῶναι*, Plat. Theaet. 201b *ἰδόντι μόνον ἔστιν εἰδέναι*. Die hier angeführten Dative gehören offenbar nicht zu den betreffenden Infinitiven, sondern zu dem durch die Infinitive ergänzten *ἔστι*. Dasselbe gilt auch in Bezug auf *συνελόντι*. Diese Dativform wird sogleich verständlich, wenn man sich *εἰπεῖν* mit *ἔστι* verbunden vorstellt. Demnach kann *ὥς συνελόντι εἰπεῖν* auf ein *ὥς ἔστι συνελόντι εἰπεῖν* zurückgeführt werden, das ursprünglich soviel bedeutete, wie 'soweit es *einem*, der die Rede zusammengefasst hat, d. i. soweit es *einem*, der sich kurz fasst, zu sagen möglich ist.'

Aus den bisherigen Erörterungen ergibt es sich, dass die fraglichen Infinitive als prädikative Ergänzungen eines *verbum valendi* aufgefasst werden können, welches unausgesprochen blieb. Es hat also mittels Ellipse Verselbständigung der betreffenden Infinitive stattgefunden. In ähnlicher Weise ist der imperativische Infinitiv und der acc. c. inf. in Gesetzen und Verträgen zu einer Form der selbständigen Aussage geworden (Brugmann-Thumb 594 u. 597). Selbstverständlich ist es nicht nötig, vielleicht gar nicht zulässig, für jede der angeführten Einschränkungsformeln die elliptische Entstehungsweise anzunehmen. Höchstwahrscheinlich hatte sich zuerst eine der ältesten Redeweisen, möglicherweise das schon bei Aeschylus (Grünenwald 22) vorkommende *ὥς εἰπεῖν* verselbständigt und danach sind die übrigen entstanden.

Jedenfalls ist die analogische Formübertragung für die übrigen, bis jetzt noch nicht behandelten Infinitive anzunehmen. Hieher gehören in erster Reihe diejenigen, neben denen auch die gleichbedeutenden Aussagen mit dem *verbum finitum* im

Gebrauch waren. Beachtenswert sind: das oft wiederkehrende *ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν* neben *ὡς μοι δοκεῖ*, das seltene *ὅσον ἐμὲ εἰδέναι* (Grünenwald 19) neben *ὡς οἶδα* od. *ὡς ἐγὼ οἶδα*, ferner Her. II 125 *ὡς ἐμὲ εὖ μεμνησθαι* neben Xen. Comm. II 1, 21 *ὅσα ἐγὼ μέμνημαι* und schliesslich Her. VII 24 *ὡς ἐμὲ συμβαλλόμενον εὐρίσκειν* neben VII 184 *ὡς ἐγὼ συμβαλλόμενος εὐρίσκω*. Alle diese Infinitivkonstruktionen sind nach dem Muster der oben besprochenen entstanden, ohne jedoch die ihnen entsprechenden Ausdrucksformen mit dem verbum finitum ausser Gebrauch zu setzen.

Als Analogiebildung ist ferner zu betrachten das restringierende *ὀλίγον* (*μικροῦ*) *δεῖν*, neben dem auch *ὀλίγον δεῖ* gebräuchlich war. Aus dem letzteren entstand infolge seiner Bedeutung (es fehlt wenig = *fast, beinahe*) nach dem Muster von *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν*, das unter Umständen dieselbe Bedeutung (*ungefähr*) hatte, die infinitivische Einschränkungsförmel *ὀλίγον* (*μικροῦ*) *δεῖν*. Unsere Annahme wird durch die Tatsache unterstützt, dass *ὀλίγον δεῖν* viel später erscheint als *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν*. Jenes wird zuerst von Isokrates gebraucht (Grünenwald 8), dieses aber findet sich schon bei Aeschylus.

Wie gross die Analogiewirkung auch auf diesem Gebiete war, ist daraus zu ersehen, dass selbst das *ὡς ἔστι*, gleichviel ob es ein *Können* oder ein *Sein* bedeute, zu *ὡς εἶναι* umgestaltet wurde. Her. IV 99 *ὡς εἶναι* (= *εἰεῖναι*) *ταῦτα συμκρὰ μέγαλοισι συμβάλλειν* (vgl. Thuk. IV 36, 3 ohne *εἶναι*: *ὡς μικρὸν μέγαλῳ εἰκάσαι*), Her. II 8 *οὐκέτι πολλὸν χωρίον ὡς εἶναι Αἰγύπτου*.

Analogiewirkungen ist ferner zuzuschreiben die Entstehung von *ἐκὼν εἶναι* und von Ausdrücken, wie *τὸ ἐπ' ἐκείνοισι εἶναι*, *τὸ νῦν εἶναι* u. a. Auffallend ist in dem Ausdrucke *ἐκὼν εἶναι* der Nominativgebrauch von *ἐκὼν*. Es wäre hier nach dem allgemeinen Sprachgebrauch ein Accus. *ἐκόντα*, pl. *ἐκόντας* zu erwarten (vgl. Her. IV 81 *ὡς Σκύθας εἶναι*, Plat. Gorg. 517 b *ὡς γε διακόνοισι εἶναι*). Die Erklärung hiefür ist die, dass *ἐκὼν* nur in Bezug auf das Subjekt gebräuchlich ist. Der acc. *ἐκόντα*, *ἐκόντας* kommt nur in der or. obliqua vor (s. Beispiele bei Grünenwald 2, 3). Ursprünglich hatte der Ausdruck ebenfalls eine einschränkende Bedeutung. Demnach heisst Plat. Symp. 214 e *ἐκὼν εἶναι οὐδὲν ψεύσομαι* 'wofern mein Freiwilligsein in Betracht kommt, d. i. wofern es von meinem Willen abhängt, werde ich nicht lügen.'

Auch die Redeweisen wie *τὸ ἐπ' ἐκείνοισι*, *τὸ νῦν εἶναι* und ähn-

liche sind ursprünglich Aussagen mit einschränkender Bedeutung. Also Xen. Hell. III 5, 9 τὸ μὲν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις εἶναι ἀπολώλατε = insoweit es von jenen abhängt, seid ihr verloren (ist es um euch geschehen). Derselbe einschränkende Gedanke wurde in Bezug auf die Vergangenheit ausgedrückt: ὅσον ἦν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις (Thesaurus s. v. ὅσον). Demnach hiesse es mit Bezug auf die Gegenwart ὅσον ἔστιν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις; allein statt dessen wurde ebenso, wie dem früher erwähnten ὅσα γε . . . ἦν εἰκάσαι und ὥς ἦν . . . ἀκούσαι, entsprechend die Infinitivkonstruktion ὥς εἰκάσαι u. ὥς ἀκούσαι, der Infinitiv gebraucht, doch ohne ὥς od. ὅσον und was noch auffallender ist, fast immer mit vorgesetztem Artikel, so z. B. τὸ ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ (ἐκείνοις) εἶναι, τὸ ἐπὶ σφᾶς εἶναι, τὸ νῦν εἶναι. Das Fehlen des ὥς oder ὅσον bei diesen Ausdrucksformen ist keine vereinzelte Erscheinung. Auch andere Redeweisen konnten ohne die restrinierende Partikel verwendet werden, wie δοκεῖν, ἀκούσαι, εἰπεῖν, so immer ὀλίγον δεῖν u. ἐκὼν εἶναι. Es liegt nahe die Vermutung, dass das partikellose ἐκὼν εἶναι diesbezüglich zum Muster für die übrigen Ausdrucksweisen mit εἶναι diene. Dafür spricht, dass ἐκὼν εἶναι schon bei Herodot vor kommt, während τὸ . . . εἶναι ausschliesslich in der attischen Prosa im Gebrauch war. Auffallender ist, wie gesagt, der Gebrauch des Artikels. Nach Grünenwald (?) und Kühner-Gerth (II 2, 19 u. II 1, 271) gehört τό zu den dem εἶναι vorgesetzten präpositionalen oder adverbialen Ausdrücken und zwar deshalb, weil diese auch selbständig, ohne εἶναι mit dem Artikel erscheinen, wie τὸ ἐπ' ἐμοί, τὸ ἐπ' ἐμέ, τὸ κατὰ τοῦτο, τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῷ, τὸ νῦν, τὸ σύμπαν u. a.

Dass diese auch selbständig gebraucht, mit dem Artikel erscheinen, beweist bei weitem nicht, dass derselbe zu ihnen gehöre. Es ist nicht ausser Acht zu lassen, dass die betreffenden, scheinbar selbständigen Ausdrucksformen eigentlich elliptische Spracherscheinungen sind. Man vergleiche Xen. An. VI 6 τὸ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἀπολώλαμεν mit Hell. III 5, 9 τὸ μὲν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις εἶναι ἀπολώλατε. Der Artikel steht also deshalb vor den praepositionalen und adverbialen Ausdrücken, weil er auch vor ihrer Verselbständigung dort stand. Doch damit ist die Zugehörigkeit des τό noch immer nicht festgestellt. Diesbezüglich verweise ich auf Folgendes. Neben den praepositionalen Ausdrücken mit vorgesetztem τό gibt es auch welche ohne Artikel, wie κατὰ δύναμιν, εἰς δύναμιν und κατὰ τοῦτο. Diese sind offenbar deshalb ohne Artikel

gebräuchlich, weil sie auch mit nachgesetztem *εἶναι* ohne Artikel verwendet werden. Plat. Polit. 300 c *εἰς δύναμιν εἶναι*, Prot. 317 a *κατὰ τοῦτο εἶναι*, Is. II 32 *κατὰ δύναμιν εἶναι*. Aus der Vergleichung der artikellosen Ausdrücke mit denen, die den Artikel vor sich haben, wie *κατὰ τοῦτο εἶναι* u. Xen. An. I 6, 9 *τὸ κατὰ τοῦτο εἶναι*, geht hervor, dass die letzteren mittelst *τό* substantivierte Infinitivkonstruktionen sind; folglich gehört der Artikel zum Infinitiv. Dasselbe bezieht sich auch auf *τὸ νῦν εἶναι*. Richtig bemerkt Stahl (674, 2): "Man hat zwar auch *τὸ νῦν* allein gesagt, aber auch *τὰ νῦν*, doch niemals *τὰ νῦν εἶναι* in einschränkendem Sinne." Auf die Entstehung des einschränkenden *τὸ . . εἶναι* war höchstwahrscheinlich der allgemeine Gebrauch des substantivierten Infinitivs von grossem Einfluss. Nach Grünenwald's Zusammenstellung kommt *τὸ εἶναι* ausschliesslich in der attischen Prosa vor, also dort, wo der durch den Artikel substantivierte Infinitiv eine oft wiederkehrende Spracherscheinung war. Möglicherweise beeinflusste seine Entstehung auch der Umstand, dass *τὸ εἶναι* auch sonst, nicht als freier Infinitiv, gebräuchlich war, wie z. B. Thuk. 7, 67 *τὸ κρατίστον εἶναι*, Dem. 1, 4 *τὸ γὰρ εἶναι*.

Zum Schlusse noch einige Worte über den Gebrauch der Partikel *ὥς*. Nach Brugmann-Thumb (595) ist *ὥς* in *ὥς δοκεῖν* und in *ὥς εἰκάσαι* jüngerer Zusatz. Grünenwald (13) bezieht dieses bloss auf *δοκεῖν*. Diese Behauptung beruht offenbar auf dem Umstand, dass *ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν* früher vorkommt und öfter gebraucht wird, als *ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν*. Dass der öftere Gebrauch des partikellosen *δοκεῖν* nachzuweisen ist, unterliegt nach Grünenwald's Zusammenstellung keinem Zweifel. Diesem Umstande ist jedoch, meines Erachtens, keine Bedeutung beizumessen. Er selbst behauptet (18), dass das verhältnismässig seltene Vorkommen von *ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν* ebenso Zufall ist, wie es ein Zufall ist, dass sich *εἰκάσαι*, eine Stelle ausgenommen (Soph. O. R. 82), immer mit *ὥς* findet. Folglich ist der öftere Gebrauch des partikellosen *δοκεῖν* ebenfalls nur dem Zufall zuzuschreiben. Für den früheren Gebrauch des alleinstehenden *ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν* findet sich der einzige Beleg aus der Zeit vor Herodot bei Aeschylus (Pers. 246). Dieses einmalige Vorkommen von *ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν* ist kein Beweis für die Berechtigung der oben erwähnten Behauptung, dass *ὥς* jüngerer Zusatz sei. Ist es denn anzunehmen, dass Aeschylus, dem *ὥς εἰπεῖν* (Pers. 714) und *ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ* mit dem

verb. fin. (Sept. 369) geläufig war, *ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν* nicht gekannt hätte? Der einmalige Gebrauch des partikellosen *ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν* beruht ebenfalls auf einem Zufall. Soviel ist gewiss, dass Herodot, dessen Geschichte nicht bedeutend später entstand als die Perser von Aeschylus, neben *ἐμοὶ δοκέειν* auch *ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκέειν* gebraucht. Meiner Ansicht nach ist *δοκεῖν* und *εἰκάσαι* aus *ὥς δοκεῖν*, beziehungsweise aus *ὥς εἰκάσαι* hervorgegangen. In ähnlicher Weise wurde beispielsweise das einschränkende *ὥς τάχος* zu dem gleichbedeutenden *τάχος*.

ARNOLD ROSETH.

BUDAPEST, HUNGARY.

III.—VIRGINIA GEORGICS.

In her recent study of the georgic as a type,¹ Dr. Marie L. Lilly has confined her investigation to the literatures of England, France, and Italy. An additional contribution to the genre worthy of note has been made by America in the Virginia Georgics,² written for the Hole and Corner Club of Powhatan County by Charles Carter Lee, a son of Light Horse Harry and a brother of Robert E. Lee. As a work of art the poem, hastily composed in the summer and early autumn of 1858, is in no respect to be compared with Virgil's masterpiece which Montaigne characterized as "*le plus accompli ouvrage de la poésie.*" And yet the poem of Lee is deserving of consideration, for it represents an interesting development of the Virgilian didactic type and also gives us insight into the ideals, interests, and practices of the cultured Virginia farmer in the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the War between the States.

Just as Virgil, working in harmony with the agrarian policy of Octavius, wished to heal the wounds caused by a century of internal conflict, so Lee hopes to serve his country by aiding in restoring the pristine fertility of her soil now impoverished not by civil war but by the neglect and waste of her sons. He therefore harks back to the Golden Age which for him extends from the time of the creation through the period of the American Revolution:

"How rich this earth in soil, how fair in face,
When the Creator gave it to our race!
How stored with game, how beautiful with birds,
And all its ranges filled with various herds:
.
.
.
Then what we have to do is, if we can,

¹ The Georgic. A Contribution to the Study of the Virgilian Type of Didactic Poetry. By Marie Loretto Lilly, Ph.D., Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1919. "Hesperia. Supplementary Series: Studies in English Philology." No. 6. Pp. viii + 175.

² Virginia Georgics, Written for the Hole and Corner Club of Powhatan, by Charles Carter Lee, One of its Members, and Published by the Club. Richmond: James Woodhouse and Company, 1858.

To make the soil such as 'twas given to man:
This how to accomplish I shall try to show
By reasons wrought to rhyme, if rhyme will flow."

The author takes up his task inspired as was Virgil by a realization of its significance for the welfare and happiness of his country:

"Therefore the way to make a nation strong,
To make it happy and be happy long,
To make it to each good and joy give birth,
Is to take care, of all things, mother earth."

The poem, numbering 2791 lines, follows the traditional division into four books. Part I gives general rules for the enrichment and restoration of the soil; Parts II and III are devoted to specific details of culture and to the raising of stock; Part IV contains precepts dealing with the garden, grounds, and building.

Though the theodicy of the Roman poet, the fundamental note of the Georgics, has had but slight influence upon the later work, yet the Virginia author in developing his theme makes use of many of the Virgilian conventions. In the first place, he is fond of casting his instruction in the form of maxims in which the farmer's lore has been clothed from time immemorial. The burden of his teaching is carried in the words:

"Till no land unless to have it rich,"

while the doctrine of economy is proclaimed in such precepts as:

"Never buy what you can raise at home;"

"Never sell wheat but in the form of flour."

The Virginian interested in the raising of cattle is reminded of the saying of the English 'yeoman' Bakewell:

"Breed the offal small,"

and the importance of the garden is summed up in the lines:

"For 'tis a mountain adage worth receiving,
That a garden makes one half your living."

In other cases well-known proverbs are given a specific application, as when the farmer battling with the weeds is told:

"Of the truth of the old adage you may be sure,
'An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.'"

The Roman farmer engaged in sowing and planting his crops was urged by Virgil to place as implicit confidence in the guidance of the heavenly bodies as did the trader on the sea. In a very real sense the stars were the "timekeepers of the ancient world." While they play a much less important part in the *Georgics* of Lee, still we find preserved in the practices of the Virginia farmer of the nineteenth century traces of the ancient customs, such, for example, as the habit of planting in the light and the dark of the moon:

"'Tis for the punctuality it produces
That farming by the moon has its good uses—
Sow that whose fruit above the surface shows
While the fair moon to its full splendor grows,
But that whose precious growth the soil contains,
Plant while the moon from her round circle wanes."

The Virginia poet follows his classical model again in the custom of adorning a prosaic subject with mythological, literary, and historical allusions, thereby adding to the pleasure of the reader by reviving agreeable memories of his studies or of his travels. The indebtedness of Virginia to Commander Lynch and his gallant sailors recalls the honor paid to Europa; the inventions of Watt and Fulton rival the work of Vulcan who "won from his forge divinity"; praise of the horse calls forth the inevitable allusion to the

"Brothers of Helen 'famed for martial force,
One great on foot and one renowned for horse.'"

Among the ancient authors alluded to by Lee, the first place is occupied by

"Homer, rhapsodist of Greece
Whose honors as the ages roll increase."

Homeric references employed to add dignity and interest to the subject include the comparison of the race of man to the leaves of the forests, the garden of Alcinous, the steeds of Achilles, the family of Ulysses, and Juno,

"bright queen of the Olympian skies
... famed for charming Jove with ox-like eyes."

From Virgil's *Georgics* the author cites by way of contrast the description of the marks of the cow best suited for breeding purposes while the Roman poet's picture of the last night of Troy furnishes an apt quotation as Lee warns his fellow-Virginians that

"Unless a change come o'er us ere too late,
The hour when we must fall is fixed as fate—
The hour when o'er Virginia and her glory
"Was" must be written as o'er Ilion's story;
'Fuit Ilium et ingens gloria Teucrorum';
And States, once ruined, nothing can restore them."

Two lines from Horace's first *Satire* are condensed and adapted by the author in condemning the farmers who drain from the soil its vitality and cling to the spoils system in spite of the hisses of their fellows:

"*Populus me sibilat, numero nummos et rideo.*"

Again he finds the precepts of the *Ars Poetica* as safe a guide for the farmer in setting out his garden as for the aspirant in the field of literature:

"Of good taste, said a bard who disclaimed flattery,
'Fons ac principium,' in all things, is 'sapere'—
Which means that Horace said with truth intense,
The fountain of good taste is but good sense;
And who neglect its rules just so far fail,
Whether in writing verse or raising kale."

The verses of Lee reveal an acquaintance not only with the classics but with the English writers as well. One meets allusions to the home of Macaulay, to the retreats celebrated by Pope, to the opinion of Byron in regard to the relation of dinner to the happiness of man, and to Samuel Johnson's estimate of him whose heart remains unstirred upon the field of Marathon. In moralizing on the resemblance in the varied life of the world, Lee makes use of Milton's comparison of the locks of Eve to the vine's tendrils, and quotes from *Paradise Lost* verses to serve as a motto for his book containing the description of the garden and home:

"Though what if Earth
Be but the shadow of Heaven, and things therein
Each to other like more than on earth is thought."

At other times the historical plays of Shakespeare furnish the needed literary allusion. Thus the poet in likening the charm of youth to the beauty of spring echoes the words of Constance addressed to the young prince, Arthur, and in the language of King Henry the Sixth at the battle of Wakefield, makes the old, old contrast between the luxury that palls and the happiness of the simple life:

"Gives not the haw-thorn bough a sweeter shade,
(As Shakespeare's almost sacred verse hath said,)
To shepherds gazing on their silly sheep
Grazing the vales, or on the hills asleep,
Than doth the rich embroidered canopy
To kings?"

The author's fondness for the Scriptures is indicated by frequent allusions, to the Old Testament especially. The references range from brief quotations such as Amos' phrase for scarcity, "cleanness of teeth," to summaries of famous biblical narratives. For example, in order to emphasize the honorable tradition of sheep-raising Lee calls to mind the famous pastoral figures of Old Testament history: Abel, Abraham, Jacob, and David. In like manner tribute is paid to the historic importance of the horse, as indicated by the story of Joseph recorded in the Book of Genesis:

"Whence he first sprung no histories contain—
We meet him first on Egypt's wondrous plain;
In the great famine, to supply their losses
Of grain, the people sold to Joseph horses—
And when his father would be buried far
From Egypt, in the cave of Machpelah,
Where Abraham, Isaac and Rebekah slept,
And where at Leah's burial he had wept,
The pious son there bore the patriarch's corse
In solemn pomp of chariot and of horse."

Whenever reference is made to the horse, Lee's enthusiasm is at once kindled. For this predilection he claims our indulgence:

"Forgive if praise of the horse I too far carry,
For my own sire was famed as Light-horse Harry."

He therefore calls upon his knowledge of History as well to add to the prestige of his favorite animal and brings in review

before us the Theban heroes going forth to war with their steeds and cars, Alexander taming Bucephalus, Napoleon on his horse at Austerlitz, Shakespeare's Richard III crying:

"A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!"

Likewise in art the horse has been associated with great heroes, for—

"What old world monument of time's long course
Is fairer than Aurelius on his horse?
What new world monument hath honor's meed
Like ours of Washington upon his steed?"

The raising of cattle also is dignified by allusions to History. Witness the honor paid to Apis by the Egyptians and to the sacred bull of Seva by the inhabitants of India. And has not Daniel Boone testified to the fact that "the milch cow's track" is the infallible sign of the march of civilization? History has other lessons as well to teach the tiller of the soil. The fall of Babylon and Nineveh, over whose ruins the nomad tribes graze their flocks, warn him that a nation's life depends upon the development of her agricultural resources, while the farmer, Ruskin's "Soldier of the Ploughshare," in his battle with the destructive forces of nature, is urged to profit by Napoleon's energy and promptness.

A further Virgilian convention is found in the presence of pictures of the social side of country life and of scenes depicting rural pastimes:

"Besides, this occupation pleasure brings—
We must not make our labours dreary things."

Hence the farmer may vary the daily toil by hunting in the forests or find diversion along the banks of the river:

"The seine on every summer's day would pour
The river's glittering treasures on its shore,
And through the winter scarce a dinner lack
The table's richest treat, the canvas-back—...
Oysters, of course, for breakfast, dinner, supper,
Both cooked and raw, with vinegar and pepper."

After reading such passages, which might have been developed into Virginia Halieutica, we are ready to join in the author's wish,—

"Long the old hospitality remain,
Supplied, each season, from a richer plain!"

Nor are these all the farmer's pleasures; the horse "whirls on the carriage" and with its offspring delights both young and old:

"The colt you raise in a domestic way,
Will in your children's raptures fairly pay. . .
And the old man the good old mare may ride,
With children on her children by his side—
A double family circle, whose delights
Power may envy on its thorny heights."

The Virgilian precedent is followed again in the introduction of descriptions of nature which grow out of the subject and open the eyes of the farmer, in Shelley's phrase, to "the hidden beauty of the world" and thus increase the joy which he finds in his daily pursuits. To the poet's æsthetic sense a strong appeal is made by the garden where

"beds of violets will earliest bloom,
And March breathe softer for their soft perfume."

And just as Virgil finds delight in watching the snow-white swans floating on the waters of the slow-winding Mincius, so Lee loves to linger on the banks of the calm Virginia stream, for

"Water-fowl of every exquisite kind
In its clear shallows plenteous feeding find,
And on the river flats outside the Creek
The glorious swans their water pastures seek."

His fancy is enchanted by the beauty of a field of growing corn:

"In April planted, scarce a fortnight shines
Ere the ploughed land it streaks with verdant lines;
Before the moon of May hath filled her horns,
Not waving wheat the landscape more adorns—
June on the season as she warmer breathes
O'er all the field, its glittering blades unsheathes—
When the midsummer's sun is flaming high,
Its tasseled head it tosses to the sky,
And at its ample bosom, filled with milk,
Its babies grow beneath their crowns of silk."

This love for characteristic scenes and favorite spots of his native state is noted everywhere in the poem of Lee. Now he

dwells upon the charm of the estate of his ancestors on the Potomac where the

"Tall Lombardy poplars in lengthened row
Far o'er the woods a dwelling's signal show."

Now his memory goes back to his grandmother's plantation on the James, "sweet old Shirley," where as a child he watched the sturdy oxen drawing to the threshing machine the wagons heavily laden with sheaves of wheat. As he looks down the vista of the coming years he finds consolation in the hope that his sons and daughters will journey to the old home and tell their children's children

"how this garden he had made,
And decked with every charm of sun and shade,
And flower and fruit."

The patriotism of Lee is inspired not only by his love for such nooks which smile for him beyond all others, but also by his reverence for the great men of his native state. As Virgil, Lee is a "*laudator temporis acti*." Both poets are fond of contrasting the evils of the present day with the virtues of the past and of pointing out the fact that the influence of the state in the future will depend upon the development of just such sturdy characters as were produced in bygone days amid rural surroundings. Lee is proud of the illustrious Virginians of the time of the American Revolution and calls upon the thirteen colonies to bear witness to their devotion to duty. He refers to the old seat of the Lees as "the birthplace of two of the signers of the Declaration of Independence" and tells of his joy that "he first saw the sunlight where the mover of Independence had his birth." But it is to Washington that he points as the noblest "*exemplar aevi prioris*." In every respect the Father of his Country is "the best of models." Virginians are urged

"to nurture
The love and admiration of his virtue."

The very remains of the patriots of the Revolutionary period make hallowed the soil of their native state. To Lee Virginia was in very truth the "*magna parens frugum, magna virum*."

Both Virgil and Lee were worshippers of Alma Pax. The

Georgics, begun five years after the battle of Philippi and completed the year following Octavius' naval victory off the promontory of Actium, reflects the Roman world's weariness of war and longing for the restoration of peace:

"*Saevit toto Mars impius orbe.*"

The Virginia Georgics, written in 1858, bears witness to the state of unrest during this tempestuous period. The slavery question had been growing more acute. The enactment of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill in 1854 was followed three years later by the Dred Scott Decision. The Douglas-Lincoln Debates were taking place at the very time the last two of the Virginia Georgics were being written. Lee had heard "strange things of the Union's fate." The storm seems about to break and destroy the work established by the hands of Washington and his compatriots:

"It seems to me that I could not alive remain
And see that glorious banner rent in twain!
But O, let me entreat, as from a brother,
Ye bannered stars smile sweet on one another."

The presence of such digressions is justified by the Virgilian precedent. The great episodes of the Georgics carry the message of the poet for his contemporaries and show the bearing of the poem upon the life of the nation. Lejay has aptly compared them to "*les chœurs de la tragédie grecque.*" As the Virginia Georgics lacks the unity of the Virgilian model the digressions are not given so artistic a rôle in the general scheme. They occur with far greater frequency; in fact more than one-half of the work is given up to the narrative episodes and to the poet's philosophical reflections. Thus in discussing the grounds and building he moralizes upon the simplicity and harmony in nature or upon the importance of environment in shaping thought or moulding character. Among his compensations the farmer finds that

"his toil still lifts his mind to heaven."

Each day as he works with the beasts of the field he may gain a deeper understanding of the dispensations of Providence:

"For all the lower creatures of the earth,
All things He ordained when He ordained their birth;

To man He gave the dignity to choose
How all the blessings offered he might use;
Nay, an indulgent Father, let his choice
Extend to hearken not to His own voice!"

In other passages the poet dwells upon man's disregard of the Will of God or upon the Creator's concern that nothing in nature be lost.

Such, in brief, are the main features of the Virginia Georgics conforming to the Virgilian conventions. The spirit and purpose of the whole poem may be summarized in the verses with which the author concludes the first section of his work:

"It was a labour of love, for all I wrote
Was but our country's interest to promote—
That of the farmer first, and then of those
Who on the farmer's interests repose—
That is of all—for, either last or first,
All at this planet's generous breast is nursed—
Repay the filial debt with liberal hand
And thus with good and glory crown the land."

HERBERT C. LIPSCOMB.

RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE.

IV.—BIBLICAL STUDIES.¹

1. The Sixth Egyptian Plague.

The sixth Egyptian plague was neither the bubonic plague, nor smallpox, nor anthrax, but *furunculosis orientalis*, i. e. tropical ulcers on the face, neck, hands, arms, and feet, known as Biskra buttons, Aleppo boils, Delhi sores, Bagdad date-marks, etc. They are due to minute parasites (*Helcosoma tropicum*) which are very similar to the Leishman-Donovan bodies constantly found in certain tropical fevers, especially in Indo-Burma (EB¹¹ 27, 345^b).² According to Ex. 9, 10, the inflammation breaking forth into ulcers was produced by soot (סֵחָלֶה). The *epithelioma scroti* seen in chimney-sweeps is supposed to be due to the irritating action of soot on the skin; but the sixth Egyptian plague was not soot-cancer. AV has *canker* (סֵחָלֶה cancer, סֵחָלֶה *hallādītā*) in 2 Tim. 2, 17; but סֵחָלֶה has γάγγραινα, and RV has substituted *gangrene* for *cancer*. Cf. my paper on Cancer in the Bible, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, vol. 74, p. 1440.

Heb. *šēhîn pôrēh āba'bū'ôt* (Ex. 9, 10) does not mean *boils breaking forth into blains* (AV): Heb. *āba'bū'ôt* is connected with Arab. *bāḡā*, to swell and suppurate; cf. *baḡḡa* and *tabāḡuḡaḡa*, to boil (syn. *hāja*, *iahîju*; *tāra*, *iatûru*) and *uābaḡ*, scurf on the head. For *pôrēh* cf. our *exanthema*, efflorescence.

¹ The following eight brief communications are abstracts of papers presented at the meetings of the Johns Hopkins University Philological Association during the academic session 1921-2 on Oct. 20, Nov. 27, Dec. 15, Jan. 19, Feb. 16, Mar. 16, Ap. 27, May 18, respectively.

² For the abbreviations see vol. 39 of this JOURNAL, p. 306; cf. vol. 42, p. 162;—ASOR = *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*;—HGP = G. A. Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*;—JPOS = *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*;—SATA = *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl neu übersetzt . . . von Gunkel, Gressman, etc.* (Göttingen);—VG = Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1908);—VS = *op. cit.* vol. 2 (Berlin, 1913);—s (supra) = above;—i (infra) = below;—< = derived from;—> = from which is derived.

Heb. *šēhîn*, inflammation, corresponds to Arab. *sazîn*, inflamed (e. g. *sazîn al-'âin*). Syr. *ašhîn* means *to cause inflammation*. Ass. *mušazzinu* denotes *boiler*, a large vessel of copper, Ass. *siparru* < Sum. *zabar* > Arab. *çifr* (ZAT 34, 144).

2. Jehoram's Fatal Illness.

According to J. Preuss, *Biblisch-Talmudische Medizin* (Berlin, 1921) p. 210, the incurable disease of King Jehoram of Judah (851-843) was *carcinoma recti*; but the great plague with which his people was stricken seems to have been epidemic dysentery (2 Chr. 21, 16. 17 is a subsequent addition; *rēkûš* in v. 14 does not mean *goods*, but *train*, retinue; cf. Arab. *ṭāqal*, baggage, train, servants, family). Jehoram suffered from dysentery for some time, and finally he had a severe attack of membranous colitis, so that complete tubular casts of the intestines were passed *per anum*. This is accompanied by excruciating pains. The correct translation of 2 Chr. 21, 19 is: *After some time, when the end came, for two days his bowels came out by reason of his illness, and he died in sore pains*. Jehoram, the husband of Ahab's daughter Athaliah, was 40 years old when he died in 843 B. C.

The Hebrew text should be read as follows: *uqîhî mi-iamîm u-kē-ēt cēt haq-qēc lē-iamîm šēnāim iacē'û me'âû*. For *mi-iamîm* cf. Jud. 15, 1. *Lē-iamîm* 1° (preceding *mi-iamîm*) < *lē-iamîm* 2° (preceding *šēnāim*). *Lē-iamîm šēnāim* in the present passage does not mean *after two days*, although *lē-šēnatāim iamîm* (2 S 13, 23) signifies *after two years*. Similarly *li-šēlôšt iamîm* (Ex. 19, 15) means *after three days*, i. e. *the day after to-morrow*; cf. *šilšôm*, the day before yesterday = Ass. *iššâšûmi* < *ina šâlši ûmi*, on the third day (AJSL 22, 251; JBL 36, 149). In Syriac we find *lē-'isrîn iaymîn*, after twenty days; cf. Ass. *ana ešrâ bêri* (ZA 25, 385) = after twenty double-hours (NE 147, 300; cf. AJSL 16, 31; contrast UG 63, 300). *Me'im*, bowels (Arab. *am'a*, Syr. *mē'āiā*) must be connected with Arab. *mā'a* and *mā'a, iam'u*, to melt, be tried out, rendered: *mā'a-s-sâmnu*, the fat (or suet) melts (syn. *dāba*). The fat which covers the intestines (i. e. the epiploic fat) and the fat which is about the intestines (i. e. the mesenteric fat) were burned on the altar (Lev. 3, 3).

3. The Valley of The Gorge.

The Book of Joel was composed c. 137 B. C. when Antiochus VII Sidetes sent Cendebæus against Judea (1 Mac. 15, 38). J. D. Michaelis (1782) said, If we want to understand Joel we must read 1 Mac. (*Joel*, n. 8; cf. JBL 34, 63⁴; AJSL 32, 69⁵). The Valley of Kidron, between the Temple hill and Mount Olivet, E of Jerusalem, is called Valley of Jehoshaphat (i. e. JHVH judged) where the Last Judgment is to be held, because Cendebæus was pursued by the Maccabees as far as Kedron (1 Mac. 16, 9) in the Philistine plain, W of Jerusalem, near the Mediterranean (JHUC 306, 13; JBL 38, 46). The modern *Qaṭra* is not Kedron, but Ekron (ASOR, No. 4, p. 6).

The Book of Joel has been called a *compendium of eschatology*, but originally there was nothing eschatological in the Book. The alleged eschatological passages in OT have, as a rule, a definite historical background, but when the prophetic bills drawn on the future were not honored, they were afterwards extended to Doomsday (JAOS 34, 413; cf. Credner, *Joel*, p. 249; also ZAT 39, 105. 110). The Valley of Jehoshaphat (i. e. the Valley of Berechah = *Wady Berêkût* in 2 Chr. 20, 26; cf. EB 541) in Joel is the Valley of Ajalon (Josh. 10, 12) which is called *Valley of The Gorge* (not *Valley of Decision*) in Joel 4, 14 (cf. 1 Mac. 16, 4-6). Modin, where the Maccabees spent the night before they routed Cendebæus in the plain, lies on the edge of the Valley of Ajalon which is a broad fertile plain and the natural entrance into Judea for the Syrian armies who came south by the coast (HGP 210). From the Valley of Ajalon three gorges break through the steep wall of the western front of the central range of Palestine (DB 1, 280⁶).

The Maccabean author of the Book of Joel prefixed an ancient poem describing an invasion of locusts (Joel 2, 2. 10. 4. 5. 7-9 + 1, 2. 5-7. 18; 2, 3). But his contemporaries no doubt referred this description to the swarms of Syrians who had come *locusting* upon Judea. This first poem, which may have been composed in the eighth century, is followed by eight Maccabean poems: II (Joel 2, 15-17; cf. 1 Mac. 1, 21-27; 7, 36; 2 Mac. 5, 15. 16; 14, 15): *Antiochus Epiphanes' Spoliation of the Temple*;—III (1, 8. 9^a. 13-15; cf. 1 Mac. 1, 45. 54; 2, 14;

3, 47. 51; 4, 38. 39; 2 Mac. 6, 2. 5; 10. 25; 13, 12; 14, 15): *Suppression of Temple Service*;—IV (1, 10. 11. 17. 16. 9^b; cf. 1 Mac. 9, 24): *Famine after Death of Judas Maccabæus*;—V (2, 21-24. 19^a. 25-27. 19^b. 20; cf. 1 Mac. 14, 8. 12): *Prosperity under Simon*;—VI (2, 12. 13; 3, 1-4; 2, 1. 6. 11^b. 2^a. 11^a; cf. 1 Mac. 16, 1-4): *Impending Invasion of Cendebæus*;—VII (4, 2. 4-8; cf. 1 Mac. 5, 1. 9. 15. 68; 10, 84. 86; 11, 60. 61; 12, 33. 48; also 1 Mac. 3, 41; 2 Mac. 5, 14. 24; 8, 25. 34): *Punishment of Heathen*;—VIII (4, 9-14^a. 17^a): *Final Battle in Valley of Gorge*;—IX (4, 18-20): *Future Prosperity of Judah*.

Poems IV and VIII are written in lines with 2 + 2 beats, while the other poems have 3 + 3 beats in each line. For the imperatives *tiq'û*, *qadděšû*, *qir'û*, etc. in 2, 15 and elsewhere (except in 2, 1; 4, 9) we must read the preterites *taq'êû*, *qid-děšû*, *qar'êû*. Similarly we must read preterites instead of imperatives in Jud. 5, 23 (WF 220; JAOS 34, 423). 6 has preterites instead of imperatives in Ps. 58, 7.

4. Heb. *pěleṭâ* and Ger. *flöten gehn*.

Ger. *flöten gehn*, lit. *to go to play the flute* (cf. *schlafen gehn*, *baden gehn*, *essen gehn*) means *to vanish*, disappear, be lost. It is generally regarded as an adaptation of Yiddish *pleite gehn* (or *Pleite machen*) which signifies *to fail in business*, be bankrupt (cf. Lagarde, *Mitteil.* 1, 99). *Pleite* is the Yiddish pronunciation of Heb. *pěleṭâ*. We find diphthongization of *e* (cf. Eng. *nâim* < *nēm* = name < *nâme*, Ger. *Name*; Sievers, *Phon.*⁵ § 768) in *Iěrûšalâim* < *Iěrûšalém* and in *bâit*, house < *bêt* < *bât* < *ba't* (ĀJSL 22, 204, n. 20; JAOS 37, 254) which is a biconsonantal noun like Ass. *šaptu*, lip (JSOR 1, 92; JBL 39, 162). For *ê* = *â* = *a'* cf. Heb. *nimçêta* = *nimçâta* = *nimça'ta*. Also *râiṣâ*, head (GB¹⁶ 737^b, l. 4) in the dialect of Ma'lûla = *rêšâ* = *râšâ* = *râ'sâ*.

Heb. *pěleṭâ* is a diminutive form like Arab. *qulâilâh*, a small jug (WdG 1, 154, C): it denotes a *small remnant*, a few survivors, a few that have escaped. In Assyrian, *balâṭu* (with partial assimilation of *p* to *l*; cf. Syr. *zêlâh* = Ass. *salâxu*, sprinkle; JBL 35, 282, n. 4; 36, 141, n. 3) means *to live*, orig. *to survive* (JBL 39, 159). Arab. *lâṭa* = *lêta* = *lâta*, i. e. 'ac-

cusative' of Ass. *lû*, would that + *ta* = *tallâhi* = *haiâta-'ullâhi* (JBL 38, 164). Also *fu'âil* = *fu'êl* = *fu'âl* (JBL 34, 74, n. 2). The original *fu'âl* is preserved not only in Ass. *uzâlu*, young gazelle; *sugâqu*, lane > Arab. *zuqâq*, but also in Arabic words like *futât*, fragment, crumb (ZAT 25, 358, n. 2; contrast *Est.* 74, n. *) or *quḏâbah*, dead branches (lopped off in dry pruning) which appears in Joel 1, 7 as *qêçâpâ* < *qêçâbâ*. For *ê* < *â* under influence of adjacent *u* cf. JBL 37, 219; AJSL 32, 66. For the signifiical development in *pêlêfâ*, escaped fugitives, and *pleite*, ruined, bankrupt, cf. Ass. *munabtu*, fugitive, and *i'abit* (< *in'abit*; cf. *i'ud* < *in'ud*) he was ruined. The *d* in Heb. *abâd* represents partial assimilation of *t* to *b* (see *Isaiah* 84, 48).

The meanings of the two phrases *pleite gehn* and *flöten gehn* are different. *Flöten gehn* (which is first found in the Hamburg dialect c. 1755: *dat Geld is fleuten gahn*, the money is lost) corresponds to the Shakespearean *to go whistle*, which is a milder equivalent for *to go to the deuce*. In German, *zum Teufel gehn* has about the same meaning as *flöten gehn*. About the end of the fourth act of *The Winter's Tale* the son of the old shepherd says: *This being done, let the law go whistle, I warrant you*. Shenston (1714-1763) says in *The Poet and the Dun*: *Your fame is secure, let the critics go whistle*. Sanders states that *flöten gehn* may refer to the *Laut, den etwas die Luft sausend Durchschneidendes giebt*. According to Grimm's *Wörterbuch*, the phrase *flöten gehn* may mean *dahin tönen in die Luft wie der verhallende Laut einer Flöte*; it resembles the phrase *fortgeblasen, weggeblasen werden*. We can say, *He just blew away for he disappeared*, vanished in thin air (cf. e. g. *The Evening Sun*, Baltimore, Feb. 24, 1922, p. 18, col. 3, l. 6). We say also *to blow a whistle* and *to blow in* = *to spend recklessly*. Ger. *Sein Geld ist flöten* is equivalent to *Er hat all sein Geld verpufft* (cf. Goethe's *Faust* 2862).

The original meaning of *flöten gehn* is to pass swiftly through the air like a whistling bullet. We say *The bullets whistled over their heads*. Ger. *pfeifen* is used in the same way. A flute is a pipe or fife. Shakespeare also uses *to whir* for *to hurry some one away* with a whizzing sound. *Whiz* denotes the whistling sound (*zip*) made by the rapid flight of a bullet or other missile through the air. In our modern slangage Ger.

flöten gehn appears as *to go flooie* or *blooey* (e. g. *Baltimore News*, Oct. 9, 1921, p. 4, col. 3; Jan. 10, 1922, p. 15, col. 4). For similar adaptations of German terms cf. *AJP* 27, 160, n. 1. *To go flooie* may be influenced by *to go up the flue*.

5. Combined Rhythms.

Several distinguished scholars believe that the poetic sections of the OT exhibit mixed meters (cf. § 4a, 6 of Cornill's *Einleitung*⁷). It is true, we find stanzas with 3 + 3 beats in each line alternating with stanzas with 2 + 2 beats (JHUC 163, 55; BL 101, l. 1). But lines with 3 + 3 beats and lines with 2 + 2 beats are not combined in the same stanza. Of course, we cannot deny the existence of mixed meters. We might just as well deny the existence of mixed rhythms. In the songs of our Indians we often find duple rhythm alternating with triple rhythm. Several tunes of this character are given in Alice C. Fletcher's *Indian Story and Song from North America* (Boston, 1900) e. g. pp. 50. 58. 66. 69. 72. 78. 98. 109. 113.

Nor are these alternating rhythms confined to Amerindian songs: we find them also in German *Volkslieder*. In the Swabian folk-song *Mädele, ruck, ruck, ruck, an meine grüne Seite* (which originated in 1836, while the tune was known in 1828) we have a 2-bar period in $\frac{4}{4}$ time followed by 1 bar in $\frac{3}{4}$ time, then 3: $\frac{4}{4}$; 6: $\frac{3}{4}$; 2: $\frac{4}{4}$; 2: $\frac{3}{4}$. The popular song *Prinz Eugen, der edle Ritter* (which commemorates the victory at Belgrade on August 16, 1717, and which is said to have been written by a Prussian soldier serving under the Prince of Dessau in Eugene's army) is sometimes barred in the following manner: 2: $\frac{3}{4}$; 1: $\frac{3}{4}$; 1: $\frac{3}{4}$; 1: $\frac{3}{4}$; 3: $\frac{3}{4}$; but it may be written in 6 bars in $\frac{5}{4}$ time. We find this anomalous measure in one of the movements of Tschaiĥovsky's *Pathetic Symphony*. The time-signatures prefixed to the compositions of the greatest masters are sometimes inaccurate. It has been observed that Schubert's *Impromptu* in B flat might be entirely rebarred. In the variations of the arietta in Beethoven's gigantic sonata in C minor, Op. 111, a section is marked in $\frac{6}{6}$ time instead of $\frac{18}{32}$, and another section in $\frac{36}{64}$ time is marked as $\frac{12}{32}$ (EB¹¹ 23, 279). Beethoven's autograph of this last pianoforte sonata, which was

composed five years before his death, has just been published (April, 1922) by the *Drei Masken Verlag*, Munich.

In harmonic music it is possible to combine different rhythms simultaneously: independent melodies may be woven into an artistic texture, and each of them may have a rhythm of its own. We often have triplets crowded into the time normally taken by two notes. In No. 20 of Mendelssohn's *Lieder ohne Worte* (Heft 4, No. 2, Op. 53) in E flat the melody has $\frac{3}{4}$ time, while the accompaniment has triplets, i. e. $\frac{9}{8}$ time. In the finale of Schumann's piano concerto in A minor the first tutti passage after the opening solo has practically duple rhythm, although the entire movement is marked in $\frac{3}{4}$ time. In the ballroom scene in Mozart's *Don Giovanni* we have three simultaneous rhythms of minuet, contredanse, and waltz. In our Indian songs there is occasionally a simultaneous combination of four or five rhythms, e. g. in the Canoe Song from C. W. Cadman's opera *Shanewis*, which has baffled some of the greatest singers of the Metropolitan Opera, while the Indian mezzo-soprano, known as Princess Tsianina, sings it with ease. A song of the Sioux's Sun Dance was sung by Marcella Sembrich at a historical song recital in New York. We find similar complicated combined rhythms in Africa. In his music dramas Wagner often combines contrasted themes having different rhythms.

Musical rhythm often radically diverges from verse rhythm. In Heine's poem *Ich unglückseliger Atlas* the first two lines of each of the four quatrains have 5 beats, while the third has 4 beats, and the fourth: 3, but in Schubert's musical setting of this poem (*Schwanengesang*, No 8) we find $\frac{3}{4}$ time throughout. There are no sapphics or alcaics in Hebrew poetry. From the Hebrew point of view the Sapphic stanza could be regarded as a quatrain with 3 + 2 beats (*Mic.* 66, n. 4) in the first three lines, followed by a hemistich with 2 beats, with a pause at the end, so that the fourth line would be practically equivalent to the first hemistichs of the three preceding lines; and if the last syllables in the first two lines of the alcaic are not stressed, this stanza might be regarded as a quatrain with 2 + 2 beats in each line. Only the number of beats is fixed in Hebrew poetry, but there may be one or two or three unstressed syllables

between two beats, or none at all, a pause taking the place of a light syllable. Hebrew poetry is not quantitative, but accentual.

6. Heb. *‘aštê* and Sum. *aš-tân*.

Heb. *‘aštê*, one, in *‘aštê-‘ašâr*, eleven, is the Ass. *īštēn*, one < Sum. *aš-tân*, the first syllable representing the numeral, and *tân* (or *tam*) the numeral affix (contrast SG 61, n. 1). Sum. *tam* (written *ta-a-an*) seems to be a compound of *ta*, what? and the affix *am* (SG §§ 199, b; 52, c). *What* may denote *something* (cf. our *I'll tell you what*) or *portion*, amount (cf. *a little what*). Also the common Chinese numerative *ko* may mean *something*. In the dialect of Shanghai, *ku* (or *kau*) appears as relative pronoun. Similar numeratives (or *classifiers*, *numeral coefficients*) are used in Siamese, Malay, etc. (EB¹¹ 6, 217^b; 25, 9^b; 17, 477^b): in Malay you say *empat biji telur* for *four eggs*, the second word (*biji*, seed) being the numerative for globular things. Similarly we find in German: *vier Stück Eier* or *hundert Stück Wild*. The driver of a Bavarian *Stellwagen* (stage-coach, omnibus) used to speak of *zehn Poststücke* (postal parcels) and *sechs Stück Fahrgäste* (passengers). We say *an orchestra of twenty pieces*. We can also say *ten head of cattle* and *twenty sail of ships*. In Pidgin-English we hear *one piecee dollar*, *three piecee man*. Cf. ἰὸς χρῆμα μέγιστον (Herod. 1, 36) etc.

The explanation of *ta-a-an* given in AL³ 36, 313; AJSL 20, 231, 24 is untenable: *ta-a-an* on pl. iii in PSBA 10, 418 corresponds to Ass. *minâ-ma*, Eth. *ment-nû*. Nor can we accept the view that 7-*ta-a-an* in an Assyrian text is to be read *sibitân* (Streck, *Assurb.* 78. 577). The use of the Sumerian affix *tam* (written *ta-a-an*) after Assyrian numerals may be compared to the ° in our 1°, 2° (= *primo*, *secondo*) for *first* and *second occurrence*, respectively. The omission of *ta* in 1-*a-an* may be merely graphic: we say *quarto*, *octavo*, no matter whether we write 4to, 8vo or 4°, 8° (contrast OLZ 25, 8).

7. Heb. *qēṣōrt* and Gr. *néktar*.

Heb. *qēṣōrt* denotes *nidor*, κνῖσα (JBL 36, 91, n. 11). This is also the original meaning of νέκταρ = נִקְטָר, i. e. that which has been made to ascend in smoke. Celestial beings feed on the fragrant steam arising from the burning sacrifices. The Hebrews

as well as the Greeks sacrificed especially the fat pieces, so *véκ-
tap* means orig. *fragrant fat* of sacrifices, then *scented unguent*. The ancients had no scents dissolved in alcohol, but perfumed greases, solid or liquid fats charged with odors. Fats and oils absorb odors. Perfumes are extracted from flowers by the agency of inodorous fats (*enfleurage*). The term *perfume* is derived from *fume* which is connected with *θύος* and *θύωμα*, incense, *θύοία*, sacrifice; *τεθυωμένος* means *fragrant*, just as Heb. *mēquṣṣār* signifies *perfumed* in Cant. 3, 6. AV has *perfume* for *qēṣōrt* in Ex. 30, 35.

For the offering of the fat pieces in the Hebrew ritual (Lev. 3, 16; 7, 25; 1 S 2, 16; 2 Chr. 7, 7; Gen. 4, 4) cf. Hesiod, *Theog.* 546 (EB¹¹ 22, 436*) and the translation of *Leviticus*, in the Polychrome Bible, p. 62, l. 2; p. 63, ll. 10-18; p. 65, ll. 34-40. When Noah after the Flood offered a burnt-offering, JHVH *smelled the sweet savor*, and the cuneiform account of the Deluge states that, when the Babylonian Noah offered a sacrifice, the gods gathered around him like a swarm of flies, so that Istar took the great fly-brushes of her father Anu, the god of heaven, to drive them away. The gods were starved, because there had been no offerings during the Flood (JAOS 41, 181).

Nectar is generally supposed to be the drink of the gods, while ambrosia is regarded as their food; but in Alcman (c. 650) nectar is the food, and in Sappho (c. 600) ambrosia is the drink. *Nectar* cannot be connected with *νώγαλα*, dainties; nor can it be explained as a compound of the negative *νη* and *κήρ*, death, or *κτείνω*, to kill: non-killing and immortalizing are not identical. *Ambrosia* has been combined with Skt. *amṛta*, the beverage of immortality, that resulted from the churning of the ocean by the gods and demons (CD s. *amṛta*). The Greeks may have connected *ἀμβρόσιος* with *ἀμβροτος*, immortal, but this is merely a popular adaptation like *ἄβυσσος* < Ass. *apsû* < Sum. *abzu* (AJP 39, 307; JHUC 306, 34). *Ambrosia* has been derived from the Semitic *'ambar*, ambergris (EB¹¹ 1, 800^b; cf. AJSL 23, 261; PAPS 46, 158) which is a fatty, inflammable mass and plays an important part in Oriental perfumery.

In the Homeric poems, ambrosia is used as a perfume (*Od.* 4, 445) and antiseptic (*Il.* 19, 40; 16, 670. 680). The ambrosia with which Hera cleanses herself (*Il.* 14, 170; cf. Judith 16, 8)

corresponds to our modern cold creams or massage creams. *Ambrosial locks* means *fragrant hair*. An *ambrosial night* is a *balmy night*, and *ambrosial sleep* denotes *balmy* (i. e. *healing, refreshing*) *sleep*.

According to *Il.* 19, 40, nectar was red. The precious nard-oil (BL 69, n. 14) had a red color (Plin. 12, 43). Also the color of myrrh, which was used as a perfume (BL 23, n. 6) and as an antiseptic (John 19, 39) varies from pale reddish-yellow to red or reddish-brown. For the antiseptic effect of various forms of incense see the paper by D. I. Macht and W. M. Kunkel, *Concerning the antiseptic action of some aromatic fumes in the Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine*, 1920, xviii, p. 68-70.

If nectar, which originally denoted the fragrant steam of the burnt-offerings inhaled by the gods, is regarded as a drink, we must remember that the Arabs say *to drink smoke* (Arab. *šariba-d-duzâna*) for *to smoke tobacco*. The phrase *to drink tobacco* was formerly used also in English: Ben Jonson (1598) says: *The most divine tobacco that I ever drunk*. Cf. my paper *Manna, Nectar, and Ambrosia* in PAPS 61.

8. The Etymology of Manna.

In Ex. 16, 15 (J) Heb. *man*, manna, is derived from *mân-hû*: when the ancestors of the Jews saw it, they said to one another: *mân-hû*, what is this? for they did not know what it was. *Mân-hû*, however, is Aramaic, not Hebrew. *š* has *mânâû* = *mânâhû* in Ex. 16, 15. In Syriac we find *mân* or *môn*, and *mânâ*, what? but the Hebrew pronoun for *what?* is *mâ*. The ancestors of the Israelites, who emigrated from the Euphrates to Ephraim, c. 1400, spoke Aramaic; but the ancestors of the Jews, who invaded Palestine from the south c. 1050, after they had sojourned in Egypt, were Edomites (JBL 36, 93). They may have spoken an Arabic dialect before they adopted the language of Canaan.³

³See my paper *Semites, Hebrews, Israelites, Jews* (OC 32, 755). Cf. Albright's article *A Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology*, JPOS 1, 66; for *Judah* see *ibid.* p. 68, n. 1; and for *Hebrew*, p. 77, n. 1. According to the dates given *ibid.* p. 79, the Exodus of the Hebrews under Moses from Egypt took place c. 1260, and the invasion of Palestine by Israel c. 1230. See also JAOS 35, 387. 390.

The popular etymology given in Ex. 16, 15 must be a late gloss. AV has *What is this?* in the margin, also *It is a portion*. In the text AV renders: *It is manna*. RV has in the text: *What is this?* and *It is manna* in the margin. In Arabic, *mann* means not only *manna*, but also *gift*, present, favor, benefit; it denotes also the manna-insect (*coccus manniparus*) which causes the secretion of the manna by puncturing the soft twigs of the *tamarix Gallica*.

The primary connotation of Heb. *man*, manna, is not *gift*, but *separation*, elimination, secretion. It is connected with the preposition *min*, from, which means orig. *part* (VS 397; GB¹⁰ 435^a, 4; GK²⁸ § 119, w, note 1). To *part* may mean to *partition*, apportion. Arab. *manîyah*, fate, signifies prop. *portion* (Heb. *mēnât*, *helq*). This is also the primary connotation of Arab. *mann* and *minhah*, gift, present (cf. *Pur.* 17, 23).

AV uses *to part* for Heb. *hîprîd* (cf. Arab. *fâraqa*) in Ruth 1, 17 where Ruth says to Naomi: JHVH do so unto me and more also (JBL 33, 164ⁱ) if aught but death part thee and me. Here Luther has: *Der Tod muss mich und dich scheiden*, and *Aus-scheidung* is the German term for *secretion* (Arab. *rašh*, *raših*). Arab. *mâna*, *îamînu*, to plow, is *to break* the ground. The original meaning of Heb. *mîn*, species, is *division*. Lat. *species* means not only *particular sort*, but also *look*, form (Heb. *tē-mûnâ*; cf. JAOS 35, 71). The post-Biblical *mîn*, heretic, signifies prop. *separatist*. Brugsch and Ebers combined Heb. *man* with the late Egypt. *mny*; if this denote *manna*, it is no doubt a loanword, so that it throws no light on the etymology.

The manna, which sustained the ancestors of the Jews in the wilderness, was not the honey-like exudation of the *tamarix Gallica*, but a nutritive lichen like the Iceland moss or the reindeer moss, especially the *lecanora esculenta*, known as *manna-lichen*, which in times of great drought and famine has served as food for a large number of men in the arid steppes of the various countries stretching from Algeria to Tatary (EB¹¹ 16, 584). Fragments of manna-lichen carried away by the wind resemble grains of wheat. They vary in size from a pea to a hazel-nut.

The edible lichens contain not only starchy substances, but also in some cases a small quantity of saccharine matter of the nature of mannite. It is probable, however, that the powdered

man-na-lichen was mixed with tamarisk-manna and alhagi-manna (Arab. *taranjabîr*). The manna-lichen was ground in querns or pounded in mortars (Num. 11, 8) and mixed with the honey-like drops from the *tamarix Gallica* or with the exudation of the camels' thorn (*alhagi camelorum* or *Maurorum*). After this mixture of powdered manna-lichen and tamarisk-manna or alhagi-manna had been baked (2 S 13, 8; NE 144, 228; AJSL 26, 16) in baking-pots (MLN 38, 433) it tasted like honey-cake or like pastry baked in sweet-oil (Num. 11, 8).⁴

Tamarisk-manna, which the monks of St. Catherine, on the highest peak of the *Jâbal Mûsâ*, supply to the pilgrims or tourists visiting the convent, appears only about the end of May and in June. The annual quantity produced on the Sinaitic peninsula is only 500-600 lbs. It could not have yielded the daily provision of more than 300 tons (Ex. 16, 16. 36; 12, 37; Num. 1, 46). It has the consistency of wax in the early morning, but melts in the heat of the sun (Ex. 16, 21). It could not have been ground in querns or pounded in mortars and baked in baking-pots. The mountain whence the Law is said to have been given to Moses cannot have been situated on the Sinaitic peninsula; it must have been a volcano in northwestern Arabia (JAOS 34, 426).

PAUL HAUPT.

⁴ JV cakes baked with oil. Luther's *Ölkuchen* is misleading; cf. MK⁴ 15, 55^b. Nevertheless this rendering is retained in SATA I, 2, p. 81 as well as in Kautzsch-Bertholet's AT⁴ (1922). An *oil-cake* is a mass of compressed seeds (linseed, rape, poppy, cotton, etc.) from which oil has been expressed; it is used as food for cattle or as fertilizer. Of the etymology of manna Gressmann says (SATA I, 2, p. 83): *Die Wissenschaft muss auf eine Erklärung verzichten*; on p. 85 he identifies the Biblical manna with tamarisk-manna.

V.—THE FASTI OF OVID AND THE AUGUSTAN PROPAGANDA.

When Ovid began his *Fasti*, Virgil and Tibullus had been dead at least some seventeen or eighteen years; Propertius, thirteen or fourteen; Horace, six or seven. Each of these poets had in his own way served the purposes of Augustus and brought his own characteristic contribution for the strengthening of the foundation on which the "First Citizen" had founded his government and himself taken his stand. Personal loyalty to Augustus and fervid devotion to the ethical and religious ideals for which he stood are apparent in the poems of Horace.¹ Propertius brought to light and put in attractive form the legends of that ancient Rome which it was Augustus' desire to glorify that the present and the future Rome might feel the obligations imposed by its long and honorable descent. Tibullus' poetry is full of the lure of that country life and that loyalty to the old religious observances, which it was the policy of Augustus to encourage, and the love of a peaceful life such as he had made possible to the Roman world. Virgil's unique genius had served the Augustan propaganda superlatively along all these lines and more. No part was wanting in the chorus of praise and prayer, nor could new forms of expression be found in verse—lyric, elegiac and epic meter, all had served their turn.

The special need, too, for such support was past, for by the time that Ovid began the *Fasti* Augustus had been accepted and established as head of the Roman state. Yet that such a versatile and prolific genius as that of Ovid should neglect entirely themes so long and so widely prominent, was hardly to be conceived. "They had become a *sine qua non* of polite literature, retained like certain parts of animal organisms, after the real need for them was past."

The subject matter of Ovid's earlier writings, those contemporary with the work of the older Augustan poets, gave little chance for the expression and propagation of Augustan ideals. Later, following the lead of Propertius, he turned from

¹ Especially, the "Roman" Odes, III: 1-6.

the light love-elegies and sentimental effusions of his youth to weightier themes, producing the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*. The clever whimsicality of the poet found opportunity even in the former, unpromising as was its theme, to sound the national note in the last three books, but it is the *Fasti* which embodies the poet's real contribution to imperial propaganda.

The subject matter itself, however treated,—those religious observances that had come down from a forgotten past and which it was Augustus' aim to emphasize as so important a strand in the unbroken thread of the eternal life of Rome—was peculiarly in line with the emperor's purpose, while the fact that the present form of the Roman calendar was due to his adoptive father might give additional appropriateness to it as a work devoted to his ends. But throughout the poem the poet finds opportunity incidentally, by way of allusion and digression, to serve these same ends.

There was no new theme to add to the repertory of the earlier Augustan poets, but Ovid runs the gamut of the old themes. With the superficiality which is his besetting sin and the versatility and lightness of handling which are among his chief charms, he touches for a moment of time, or lingers on, these themes as circumstances permit or encourage him to do so. The country life and festivals of which Tibullus sang, Ovid has made the main subject of his work. In personal glorification of Augustus and his policies he goes, though less wisely, to even greater lengths than Horace. The celebration of "the grandeur that was Rome" and of her mission among nations, the idea which pervades the whole *Aeneid* and "like the subject of a fugue enters and reënters from time to time in thrilling tones,"² is a constantly recurring motif in the *Fasti*, though sounded in the notes of tinkling cymbals as compared with the organ tones of Virgil.

The emperor himself and the city whose power and prestige are at once his creation and his justification, are perhaps equally prominent in the *Fasti*. The descent of Augustus and his divinity, his achievements in war, his offices, his achievements in peace—architectural, ethical, religious—and his personal

² Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, p. 409.

qualities, all are brought out at one or more points in the poem, some as the nature of the work demands, in association with specific dates, some as gratuitous amplification, while the city of Rome is again and again introduced—its history, its marvelous growth and present magnificence.

The re-dedication of the *Fasti*, whereby Germanicus took the place of Augustus, has wrought confusion in the study of imperial propaganda in the first book. In the case of certain significant passages of eulogistic allusion or address there is doubt, reasonable or unreasonable, as to whether Augustus or Germanicus is the person concerned.³ Even so, however, a considerable number of undoubtedly relevant passages remain in this book to add to the testimony of the others. Almost at the outset (1, 10) Germanicus is informed that he will often in the following pages read of his father and his grandfather,

saepe tibi pater est, saepe legendus avus,

in whose glory he and his brother are to share, and definite statements are made as to the nature of what he is to read. It is not of Cæsar's wars, but of Cæsar's altars and the festivals that he has added to the calendar that the poet will sing, in this way bringing Augustus into as close connection as possible with the *sacra . . . annalibus eruta priscis* which he has already promised (1, 7) to display to his readers.

More than once Germanicus might have read of Augustus as himself counted among the divine beings whose altars he had established or restored. The prophecy of Carmentis in Book I shows two instances of this. As she and Evander sail up the Tiber, she can hardly be restrained by her son from leaping in ecstasy on to the shore as she salutes the gods of the new land, and the land itself, destined to give new gods to heaven (1, 510). More definitely, she alludes to the Julian family when she prophesies (1, 530) that the sacred rites of Vesta shall in the distant future be performed by a god in person, referring to the occupancy of the office of pontifex maximus by Augustus. The entry for March 6, on which date

³See R. Merkel in the *Prolegomena* to his critical edition of the *Fasti*. Also G. H. Hallam and H. Peter in the introductions and notes to their editions of the same.

Augustus assumed this office, emphasizes the same thought—"the divinity of immortal Cæsar (*aeterni Cæsaris*) presides over the eternal fires" (3, 421); while in 4, 954 the same epithet is applied to Augustus in conjunction with Apollo and Vesta.

Besides claiming a place for Augustus in the hierarchy of Heaven, Ovid has much to say of his relation to Vesta and his relationship to the patron divinities of Rome, Venus and Mars, emphasizing thereby the direct outgrowth of Rome from Troy. The passage just quoted ends (3, 428) with the expression of the wish that both the fires of Vesta and the *dux* himself may live,—

vivite inextincti, flammaque duxque, precor,

and an actual relationship between the emperor and the goddess (through their Trojan origin)⁴ is assumed in the same passage (3, 425),

ortus ab Aenea tangit cognata sacerdos
numina; cognatum, Vesta, tuere caput,

while in another, where the introduction of Vesta into the palace of the emperor is celebrated (4, 949) it is taken for granted, as the goddess is represented as received *cognati . . . limine*.

There is said to have been a prophecy in the Sibylline Books that leadership of the world should go with descent from Troy through the preservation and possession of the Trojan *sacra*, and the Sibylline Books are said to have been placed by Augustus under the base of the statue of Apollo in his temple on the Palatine.⁵ Ovid accepts without question the theory of descent as to which Livy has his doubts and even Virgil is not wholly consistent in his statements (*Cf.* *Aen.* 1, 267; 8, 629; 9, 641, with 6, 762),⁶ tracing the Julian *gens* directly through Iulus—Ascanius to its Trojan forebears, and making this relationship prominent in many places. Very near the beginning of the poem (1, 39) Mars and Venus are introduced as

⁴ In 1, 528, however, Vesta is an Italian goddess.

⁵ *Cf.* Eduard Norden, "Vergil's Aeneis im Lichte ihrer Zeit," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, Vol. VII (1901), p. 263.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 277.

the presiding deities of successive months, March and April, and their relationship to the reigning family noted: "The first month belonged to Mars, the second to Venus; she was the first of the race, he was the father of Romulus' self." The naming of these months indeed is credited to Romulus, whose reverence for his own ancestors was combined with prophetic vision of Augustus' relationship to the same (4, 23), while Romulus is again designated as a link in the chain binding Rome to Troy by the patronymic *Iliades* applied to him (4, 23; 5, 565) and to himself and Remus (3, 62).

The fourth book, devoted to the month of Venus is, naturally, particularly rich in references to the genealogical connection between this goddess and the Julian *gens*. In the introduction to the book (4, 21) the poet commends this portion of his work particularly to Augustus: "This month comes to you through your great ancestress and becomes yours by your adoptive nobility." The entry for April 23, in commemorating the introduction of the worship of Venus Erycina, claims a preference of the goddess for the city of her descendants (4, 875) in a general way, and Venus Verticordia is called upon (4, 161) to respect the Roman race. Earlier in the book (4, 119) we see Venus fighting against the Greeks on the side of Troy, winning the victory over Juno and Minerva in the judgment of Paris, a Trojan, and by a Trojan, Anchises, becoming *nurus* to Assaracus (and so mother of Aeneas and grandmother of Ascanius or Iulus) for the express purpose of providing for "mighty Cæsar" ancestors of the Julian name. The presence of the Palladium in the temple of Vesta also furnishes a link between Rome and Troy, and the poet takes occasion to introduce briefly, in connection with this (6, 419) the names of Dardanus and Ilus. An even more definite linking of the latest generations of the royal family with the earliest and with their ancestral Troy is found in the formal genealogical table beginning with Dardanus (4, 31) and ending: "We come at last to the propitious name of Iulus, through which the Julian family touches its Trojan ancestors," and in 4, 272 where (through the *Magna Mater*)—in *Phrygios Roma refertur avos*. Lastly (4, 675), Venus as patron of the month bids its fifteenth day hasten on its way in order to give place as soon as possible

to the sixteenth, the day on which her descendant, Octavian, is to receive the title of *Imperator*.

Aeneas, he who "carried Troy to Rome" (4, 250; 1, 527), is implied as ancestor to the Julian family at the end of the first book, where the wish is expressed that the whole world may shudder before the power of the Aeneadae, and Mars appears twice as ancestor, once (5, 554) in his new temple⁷ built by Augustus in "the city of his son," once (6, 54) as receiving Juno into the "city of her grandson."

Another ancestor in the noble line to be celebrated is naturally Julius Cæsar. His reformation of the calendar is alluded to (3, 155)—with the whimsical suggestion that his object in this work was to become acquainted with the Heaven he was later to inhabit—as one among many achievements, but not dwelt upon seriously as might perhaps have been expected in a poem based upon this work. The entry for April 6, the date of the battle of Thapsus (4, 381), is the occasion for a brief eulogy of the first Cæsar supposed to be uttered by an old soldier of his who sits next to Ovid at the games—"Cæsar was my leader, and I boast that under him I served as tribune"—and Ovid represents himself (3, 697) as being reminded by Vesta herself not to pass over in his record for the Ides of March *gladios in principe fixos*. There is also a bit of eulogy in a curious passage (1, 603) where the title *Augustus* is made the climax in a list of cognomina, among which in due order is that of Pompey—*Magnus*—which suggests that his conqueror, Cæsar, should have one indicating something still greater—*qui te vicit nomine maior erit*. Neither of these passages brings out the relationship between the first Cæsar and Augustus, but it appears in a reference to the battle of Philippi (3, 707), which is designated as an act of *pietas*—an appropriate form of vengeance taken by Octavian on those who were responsible for the death of his adoptive father. And while the long and honorable descent of the Julian *gens* and its present superlative importance are made strikingly prominent, its future—its permanence as the ruling dynasty of Rome—is hinted, by prayer if not by prophecy (1, 721; 4, 859). Flattery

⁷ The temple of *Mars Ultor*.

of a complicated and ingenious pattern is worked in by the poet, at the end of Book VI, for the date of June 30. First the day is designated as that whose "tomorrow" is the Julian (July) Kalends. Then it is characterized as the day on which the temple of Hercules and the Muses, near the Circus Flaminius, was dedicated, and Lucius Marcius Philippus is named as the founder. As a matter of fact, Philippus was merely the restorer, not the founder, of this temple, which had been built in 187 B. C. This naïve oversight on the part of Ovid is no doubt due to the fact that Lucius Marcius Philippus was the husband of Atia, an aunt of the emperor. The family relationship is cleverly suggested by the introduction, quite superfluously, of a daughter of this pair (herself the wife of a friend of Augustus), Marcia, and is definitely noted several lines farther on.

The various titles assumed by or conferred upon Octavian himself are in a general way included in the statement near the beginning of the second book (2, 15),

At tua prosequimur studioso pectore, Cæsar,
nomina, per titulos ingredimurque tuos,

and are alluded to separately in many places. He is *Princeps*, in flattering contrast to Romulus, who was *dominus* (2, 142). References to the title *Imperator* (bestowed April 16, 29 B. C.), *Augustus* (won January 13, 27 B. C.) and *Pater Patriæ* (February 5, 2 B. C.) all appear in the entries for the dates of these anniversaries (4, 675; 1, 609; 2, 127) respectively. (*Pater Patriæ* is also used in a prayer for the emperor's welfare at the festival of the Caristia, 2, 637.)

The second of these titles is granted for the young Augustus' success in war. The third he holds in common with Jupiter himself. The word *Augustus* is derived from the root *aug-* (*augere* = increase), and a prayer—

Augeat imperium nostri ducis, augeat annos—

is based upon this fortunate etymological relationship. In the reference to the last title (*Pater Patriæ*) the most effusive eulogy is embodied. To celebrate aright the anniversary of its bestowal would require the soul of a Homer, and the dignity of hexameter verse. The people, the senate, the *equites* have

all united in giving the title, but they have given it late, for long since Augustus was *Pater Orbis*. In this cognomen, as well as in that of Augustus, he is on a par with Jupiter, who is *Pater* in heaven, while the emperor is *Pater* on earth.

Virgil's first plan of the *Aeneid*, according to *Geor.* 3, 16 ff., was to make it a heroic epic with Augustus as its central figure. By the time he wrote the poem, circumstances had changed. The military deeds of Augustus were overshadowed by his achievement of peace and his achievements in peace, and were to the people important chiefly as "war to end war." The *Aeneid* takes its tone from this circumstance and does not correspond to the poet's earlier conception of what it should properly be.⁸ Ovid indicates in the dedication of the *Fasti* (1, 13) that he will take this same line, leaving the "arms of Caesar" to the pens of others, and he lives up to this statement on the whole, even beyond the extent to which the chosen subject of the poem necessitates this.

The military activities and successes of the emperor are however by no means passed over in silence. Near the beginning of Book II (2, 18) the poet ends his appeal for the attention of the ruler with the words "*pacando si quid ab hoste vacas.*" The recovery of the standards lost to the Parthians by Crassus in 53 B. C. is given its due meed of praise. In the entry (6, 467) for June 9, the date of the death of Crassus, Vesta prophesies the future restoration of the standards he has lost:—

"Parthe, quid exultas?" dixit dea, "signa remittes,
quique necem Crassi vindicet, ultor erit."

The accomplishment of this vengeance is reported in the preceding book (5, 587); this disgrace would have remained to the present time, did Italy not enjoy the protecting power of Caesar. This achievement, says the poet, no less than the victory at Philippi, the ostensible occasion for the building of the temple of Mars Ultor, might win for the god the cognomen thus commemorated.

Without reference to definite campaigns or battles there are various vague allusions to the enlarging of the power and the

⁸ Cf. Norden, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

extension of the limits of the territory of Rome. In 1, 599 (Jan. 13) Germanicus and Augustus are combined in a brief eulogy evidently constructed when the work was revised after the death of the emperor. This was the day on which the action of the emperor in returning to the senate the control of the provinces won for him the title of *Augustus*, formally conferred three days later. Germanicus' father, says the poet, won his cognomen *Germanicus* from the conquest of one part of the world. If the same basis were to be used for the bestowal of cognomina on Octavian, he would have as many as there are races on the earth:—

si petat a victis, tot sumat nomina Caesar
quot numero gentes maximus orbis habet.

The co-extension of the city with the world which might thus furnish titles to its ruler is brought out in another passage (2, 683) marking the date of the festival of Terminus. Other races, sings the poet, possess land set off by definite boundaries; the boundary of the city of Rome and of the world itself is one. The same idea appears in the recognition of *Pater Patriae* as synonymous with *Pater Orbis* (2, 130), in the introduction to the whole work (1, 85) where Jupiter as he looks from his temple on the Capitoline can see nothing which is not Roman, and in the prophecy, dating from the time of Romulus (4, 858), that Rome shall one day set her victorious foot on the whole world.

In one way or another, too, the important battles on which Augustus' fortunes hung are at least touched upon, but they are not greatly emphasized in and for themselves. The battle of Mutina is briefly introduced (4, 627) in association with a general weather prophecy for the day on which it took place—April 14. On this day, says the poet, ships should seek safe harborage, for west winds and hail are likely to prevail. Yet in spite of weather, Augustus on this day was victorious at Mutina. The date of the battle of Philippi being in the autumn, the part of the *Fasti* in which it would have been cited either has not come down to us or was never written. There are, however, at least two allusions to the battle, both emphasizing its importance as the means by which Augustus inflicted punishment upon the murderers of the first great

Julius. One of these (3, 705) states this definitely:—"Those who, daring a deed in opposition to the gods' will, had violated the pontiff's life, rightly lie low in death. Be witness to this Philippi, and ye with whose scattered bones the earth is white. . . . To avenge his father through arms justly taken up was the first work of Cæsar (Augustus)." The other (already quoted in part), inserted in the account of the founding of the temple of Mars Ultor (5, 569), implies it: *cum pia sustulit arma* (at Philippi) this temple was vowed, promised in return for victory. The battle of Actium is recalled in the passage celebrating the dedication of the Altar of Peace (1, 711). The altar was decreed by the senate only after the return of the emperor from Spain, 13 B. C., and dedicated in 9 B. C., but as Actium stood to the Roman as the beginning of the reign of Peace, the poet here in apostrophizing *Pax* decks her in garlands won in the victory at Actium. Association of the military and civic sides of Augustus' career is again emphasized in the references to the laurel decking the door posts of the palace and the civic crown of oak set above the door in accordance with a decree of the senate in 27 B. C. (4, 953; 1, 614).

But the peace of Augustus is celebrated in more definite and positive fashion than this, even if various striking lines in Book I, as to the date of which authorities differ, be all counted for Germanicus rather than for Augustus. The permanence of the Augustan peace is prayed for in the line (1, 712) following that quoted above:

Pax ades et toto mitis in orbe mane!

and again (4, 407):

pace Ceres laeta est, et vos orate, coloni,
perpetuam pacem pacificumque ducem,

and it is heralded in the words of Janus (1, 282, assigned by Hallam, however, to the revision):

"Cæsareoque diu nomine clusus ero."

In other passages Mars himself is called upon to sponsor the works of peace. At the beginning of the third book the poet apostrophizes this god with the advice that he lay aside his

weapons for the time, and, following the example of Minerva, add to his sphere of influence the *artes ingenuae*—reminding him that he was unarmed when Rhea Silvia, ancestress of the Roman race, accepted him as her lover. On another occasion (3, 175), when asked to explain the fact that the festival of the Matronalia occurs on his Kalends, the war-god becomes himself almost an advocate of peace. Taking the cue offered by the poet he declares that he does not regret this new association with the affairs of peace, nor the fact that Minerva can no longer consider herself the only divinity whose field of activity covers both peace and war. It is perhaps over-fanciful to look for any subtle significance apropos of the times in the fact that when Mars, as he speaks here,—as if bearing in mind Ovid's earlier prayer (3, 1) that he lay aside shield, spear, and helmet,—removes the helmet from his head, though he still retains the spear.

Besides this general emphasis on the advantages of peace, there are some more specific references to certain acts and characteristics of the emperor in his capacity of civil ruler. He is contrasted (2, 141) with Romulus, whose power depended on force, as one under whom law flourishes rather than violence:

vis tibi [Romulo] grata fuit, florent sub Cæsare leges.

The *cura legum et morum* had been given to the emperor by the senate in 19 B. C., and he is represented in the *Fasti* (6, 643; 647) as furnishing an example to others by tearing down, as too sumptuous, an edifice bequeathed to him, and erecting in its place the *Porticus Livia*:

sic agitur censura et sic exempla parantur,
cum vindex, alios quod monet, ipse facit.

The effectiveness of the emperor's efforts toward moral reform is noted in a brief allusion to the laws against adultery (2, 139),⁹ and in the prophecy (6, 457) that while Augustus is head of the religion of Rome no vestal virgin will desecrate her sacred fillets and suffer the penalty of burial alive prescribed therefor.

This subject leads naturally to the discussion of Augustus' attitude toward the Roman religion and the measures he took

⁹ Cf. Horace, *Od.* 3, 6.

for its encouragement and revival. In choosing the *Fasti* as his subject, the poet bound himself of course to stress above all else the religious side of the reforms and activities of Augustus. In the introduction to the first book (1, 13) it is plainly put that it is of the altars and the religious festivals of Caesar that he will chiefly sing. Both the places of worship and the ceremonials are, according to this, to be included. Among these places the altar of Peace (1, 709) and the temple of Mars Ultor (5, 550) are most conspicuous. A brief reference is made (3, 704) to the temple of the Divine Julius, built by Augustus, as a piece of earthly property still held by Caesar while his home is in heaven with Jupiter. The emperor's well-known activity as restorer as well as builder of temples follows a reference to the disappearance through neglect of an old temple of Juno Sospita (2, 55), the sad fate of which Augustus has warded off from other temples, thereby laying not only men but gods under obligation to him to such degree as to justify the prayer with which the poet ends the passage:

Templorum positor, templorum sancte repostor,
sit superis, opto, mutua cura tui.
Dent tibi caelestes, quos tu caelestibus, annos.

Of these numerous restorations, that of the temple of *Magna Mater* is briefly referred to (4, 348) and that of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus is implied in the words (1, 203):

frondibus ornabant quae nunc capitolia gemmae.

The zeal of her husband along these lines is cited (5, 157) as the reason for Livia's undertaking similar work in the case of the temple of the Bona Dea:

ne non imitata maritum
esset et ex omni parte secuta virum.

Augustus had become pontifex maximus on March 6, 12 B. C. In this capacity he was head of the Roman religion as a whole and was brought into particularly close relationship to the worship of Vesta. We find in the *Fasti* this close connection more than once emphasized. The poet puts in the mouth of Carmentis a prophecy (1, 529) that the time will come when one and the same man shall protect Vesta and the

Trojan gods and the world itself, and the rites of Vesta shall be performed by a god as worshipper. The fulfilment of this prophecy is recorded in the entry for June 9 (6, 455),

nunc bene lucetis sacrae sub Cæsare flammae,

and in that for March 6 (3, 421):

Ignibus aeternis aeterni numina praesunt
Cæsaris.

Augustus has become, like the sacred fire of Vesta and the Palladium, a pledge of the power of Rome—*imperii pignora iuncta vides*.

The introduction of the worship of the Genius of Augustus¹⁰ in conjunction with the Lares was to be commemorated in its proper place, the month of August, as the poet tells us (5, 147) at the close of a passage dealing with the re-dedication of an altar of the Lares Compitales on May 1. Ovid represents himself as looking for Lares in couples, as heretofore they had been found, but as finding everywhere groups of three, the Genius of the emperor making a third with the two Lares. In his interest he is about to go on and tell the story of the transformation of this duality into a trinity,¹¹ but checks himself—*Augustus mensis mihi carminis huius ius habet*.

The record for April 28 (4, 949) celebrates the dedication of the chapel of Vesta in the palace on the Palatine. The close association of this building with the temple of Apollo leads to the establishment in the mind of the poet of another trinity in which the emperor finds a place—Vesta, Apollo and Augustus.¹²

Of the edifices with which Augustus adorned the city Ovid mentions besides the temples of Mars Ultor (5, 551) and of Julius Cæsar (3, 704) and the *Ara Pacis*, (1, 709), the *Porticus*

¹⁰ Cf. J. B. Carter, *The Religious Life of Ancient Rome*, p. 70. See also Lily R. Taylor, "The Worship of Augustus in Italy during his Lifetime," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LI, p. 116.

¹¹ The account of the festival of the Caristia (2, 637) ends with the suggestion of a prayer to this new trinity.

¹² The relation of Apollo to Augustus seems to be more conspicuous in the *Metamorphoses* than in the *Fasti*. See Elizabeth H. Haight, "An Inspired Message" in the Augustan Poets," *American Journal of Philology*, XXXIX, p. 360.

Livia (6, 639) and the Forum of Augustus. Of these, the temple of Mars Ultor is the only one that is honored with any detailed description.

Before leaving the subject of Ovid's attitude toward Augustus as man and ruler it will be worth while to notice especially two passages of general eulogy which are worthy of the pen of Martial when running riot on the subject of Domitian. One of these has already been considered in part and it will be sufficient to recall its climax (1, 608) where Augustus by that cognomen is put on a par with Jupiter. In the other and more important passage the poet likewise sets Augustus practically on a level with the father of gods and men, as *Pater Patriae* this time (2, 131), and then proceeds to point out that he is to be placed above the divine Romulus (2, 133-144). According to Suetonius (*Div. Aug.* 7) the cognomen Romulus had been suggested for Octavian in 27 B. C., as being the name of the founder of the city (not, naturally, as the name of a king). Ovid, whether with conscious purpose or not, helps to justify the refusal of this title by comparing and contrasting Romulus and Augustus in several definite particulars, to the advantage of course of the latter. Romulus' power was felt by the Sabines and by small Cures and Caenina; under Augustus all that lies within the sun's path is Roman. Romulus held a small bit of conquered territory; Augustus holds all that lies beneath the sky. Romulus stole the wives of men; Augustus bids them maintain their chastity. Romulus created a refuge for evil; Augustus does away with evil. Force was dear to Romulus; law holds sway under Augustus. Romulus bore the name of *dominus*; Augustus bears that of *princeps*. Romulus is under accusation by his brother; Augustus has granted pardon to his enemies. And—as a climax—Romulus was made a god by his father; Augustus made his father a god!

The unity of Roman history with Trojan history and within itself is implied by Ovid in those passages already cited which proclaim the descent of the Julian *gens* from Trojan ancestors. In another way it is implied by allusions to *Roma* as in reality a *Troia Rediviva*, and by many references to the development of the later city from the Romulean village—usually with wondering emphasis on the great changes and improvements which

time, especially at the behest of Augustus, has brought about. Past and present are linked as one, and both are worthy of admiration.

Allusion to the contrast between the site of the city and the city built upon the site is frequent. It is baldly mentioned in the account of the arrival of Evander and Carmentis in Italy (2, 280):

hic ubi nunc urbs est, tum locus urbis erat.

In other passages unfelled woods and pasture lands (1, 243), grassy pastures, small herds of cattle and scattered huts (5, 93) and the loneliness of the river bank in Evander's time (1, 502) in more detail are explicitly or implicitly set off against the "great city," "ruler of the world," "giver of laws to the world" which later takes their place.

The changes due to the draining of the swampy land along the river and between the hills, the buildings erected where in early times were only pools and marshes, are emphasized. Twice the various Fora emerge from the watery waste:

hic, ubi nunc fora sunt, lintres errare videres (2, 391),

hoc, ubi nunc fora sunt, udae tenuere paludes (6, 401),

and the altar that stood on dry ground where the *Lacus Curtius* had been (6, 404) makes the picture still more vivid.

Where lies the Velabrum, over which the processions pass from the Forum to the Circus in Ovid's day,

nil praeter salices cassaque canna fuit (6, 406),

and where the Circus itself stood later, boats floated in early times when the river was swollen with winter rains (2, 392)—the implication being, perhaps, that it had not yet felt the restraining hand of Augustus (Suet. *Div. Aug.* 30).

Comparison between the simplicity of early buildings and the elaborateness of the Augustan architecture and equipment is implied in the reference to the *fictile fulmen* of the first embodiment of Jupiter Capitolinus and the simple garlands with which his temple was adorned (1, 202) and the treasure lavished upon his temple by Augustus, and to the contrast between the earlier temple of Vesta with its roof of thatch and the later

with its roof of bronze (6, 261). By implication, too, is suggested a comparison of the sumptuous buildings on the Palatine of Augustus' day with the "royal residence" of Romulus, which was but a hut of reeds (3, 183), and the "large" palace of Numa (the Regia), which occupied only the narrow space of Vesta's atrium (6, 263).

No less than four times the poet expresses wonder at the growth of the city as a whole, her splendor and her power, developing from the humblest of beginnings. Once (3, 433) it is the establishment of the famous *Asylum* by Romulus that gives occasion for the expression of this wonder in the form of an exclamation:

O quam de tenui Romanus origine crevit!

and the Roman people itself rather than the city seems to be in mind. In the speech of Mars explaining the origin of the *Matronalia* and this god's relation to it, the story of the rape of the Sabine women is introduced by an expression of the same thought, with the addition of a prophecy as to the future greatness of the city (3, 179): Rome was then small, but in that small city was the hope of the present city; its walls, ample for its people then, were of too narrow compass for the peoples who should dwell there in the future. The Roman already had a name greater than the place. But the most attractive and interesting development of this theme occurs in the prophecy uttered by Carmentis when she and Evander land on the banks of the Tiber in pre-Roman days (1, 515, already cited in part). We have here a reference not only to the *ingentia moenia* which shall some day overlook the lonely river bank, but to the founder of the race which shall dwell within these walls—the Race of Troy, which shall thus rise again and carry on its traditions unbroken, through the acceptance of its gods by Vesta and the final taking over of their worship by Augustus as pontifex maximus.

Not only is the greatness of Rome celebrated, but her permanence also is anticipated. Romulus is *aeternae . . . pater urbis* (3, 72), and in the prayer to Jupiter, Mars, Vesta, and others, ascribed to him when laying the foundations of his city (4, 831), he is made to voice the same thought:

"longa sit huic aetas dominaeque potentia terrae
sitque sub hac oriens occiduusque dies."

These lines are found in the story of the founding of the city which completes the account of the festival of the Parilia, commemorating that event. In the concluding lines of this narrative (4, 857) Ovid in his own person mingles prayer and prophecy with similar import:

Urbs oritur (quis tunc hoc ulli credere posset?)
victorem terris impositura pedem.
cuncta regas et sis magno sub Cæsare semper,
saepe etiam pluris nominis huius habe;
et quotiens steteris domito sublimis in orbe,
omnia sint umeris inferiora tuis.

It is chiefly to the past that the poet looks for material to dignify the present.* But in these last passages at least, he hints that the chain which binds past and present will bind present and future to all eternity. And in this prophetic vision the eternity of the city is linked inseparably with the permanence of the Julian dynasty:

cuncta regas et sis magno sub Cæsare semper!

KATHARINE ALLEN.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

REPORTS.

PHILOLOGUS LXXVI (1920), Heft 3/4.

Pp. 240-265. A. Gudeman, Die syrisch-arabische Uebersetzung der aristotelischen Poetik. The Arabic translation of the Poetics found in a Parisian ms. (882 A) of the tenth or eleventh century has long been known to orientalists but its dreadful condition has made scholars loath to use it through translation for a recension of the Greek text. In 1872 Sachau copied it and made a literal German translation for Vahlen who cited it but once. In 1887 the Oxford Arabist, D. Margoliouth, published the Arabic text in his *Analecta Orientalia ad Poeticam Aristoteleam* and added (pp. 46-72) *Symbolae orientales ad emendationem poetices*, which offered about 30 noteworthy readings, some new, others confirming the conjectures of modern scholars. Not until Margoliouth's edition of the Poetics (1911) was a complete translation from the Arabic available. Dr. Gudeman, who is preparing a critical and exegetical commentary on the Poetics, by applying as a test the transcription of the proper names, made the important discovery that the Greek original was a majuscule ms. in scriptura continua and so must have belonged at the latest to the fifth or sixth century. It is therefore *a priori* probable that such a codex would offer a text of no little value. By making use of Sachau's German and Margoliouth's Latin versions, together with the paraphrase of Averroes and the Poetica of Avicenna (both of whom used a better manuscript than that at Paris), Dr. Gudeman has found over 400 important readings which can be ascribed to the Greek original. One hundred and fifty passages confirm conjectures of modern scholars; more than 100 agree with one or another ms. and have preserved the correct reading; 170 offer new readings which are for the most part improvements on the vulgate and which, in any case, are noteworthy variants. The reconstructed Greek majuscule must from now on be rated in the very first rank as a source for the text. To illustrate the value of the readings the writer discusses 36 passages.

Pp. 266-292. R. Asmus, Kaiser Julians Misopogon und seine Quelle. Part I. Not only the underlying thought but, in part, also the structure of the peculiar work are to be gathered from Julian's sixth oration against the Cynics (p. 244, 15 Hertlein), in which he calls them false disciples of Diogenes and points out to them that in self-knowledge lies the essential position of Cynicism and philosophy. In support of this the emperor appeals to the Alcibiades I ascribed to Plato. The

dependence of the Misopogon on the Alcibiades I is shown by parallel passages. The Misopogon is divided into an introduction and three parts, each containing three divisions, the last of which is separated from the first two by a picture-like insert. The first part describes the emperor's opinion of his own appearance and mode of life and contrasts the ways of the Antiochenes. The second part tells of what he offers to, and withholds from, them in his external intercourse. The third part explains why Julian and the Antiochenes have quarreled; he needs to learn self-knowledge and study how to adapt himself. (To be concluded.)

Pp. 293-331. L. Gurlitt, Tulliana. Critical notes. I. Epistulae ad Atticum. V 4, 1. The letter refers to the projected marriage of Tullia. Read: ac ne illud quidem laboro . . . adduci ut nostrae (i. e. Tulliae) possit et tuis . . . res habebit mirationem. V 11, 6. Read: Tu praefectis excusationes, quas voles, deferto. V 11, 7. Read: Nam illam *μοναρχίαν* (sc. Caesaris) excusationem ne acceperis. VII 7, 1. For *putato* read *perusitatum*. VIII 11, 4. Read: aestate (aut alterius) aut utriusque imman(ibus) copiis. X 12a, 4(7). Read: modo aliquid *ἦθος ἀκριβολόγον*. X 13, 3. Read: habes *κέλητα* *ἄοκνον*. X 17, 1. Read: vellem *κέλητα* eius . . . cumulatissime *κέλητα*. XI 6, 2. Read: quos (i. e. lictores) ego Non. (i. e. Nov. 5) paulisper . . . in turbam conieci . . . ne quis . . . fieret; recipio: tempore me domi tenere ad oppidum et quonam iis placeret modo propius accedere, ut hac de re considerarent. *Recipio* is a juristic term; *tempore* = at the right time, i. e. by day. Also punctuate: me non angeret Brundisi iacere; also read: in omnibus portibus. XI 9, 1. Read: a. d. III Non. Ian. XI 14, 3. Read: Te a. d. V Idus tamen exspecto, quem videre, si ullo modo potes venire, pervelim. . . . Ibi facile est (quid?) quale sit illius *γραφαῖς* (?) existimare. XI 17a, 1 (= 17, 1). Read: Itaque *ἡματίαν* (i. e. by day); for proea read: prid. or pr. Id. The second letter began: Quod ad modum consolantis scripsisti P(omponiam?) tantum de me scripsisse, (respondeas ei quaeso) quae tu ipse intelligis responderi posse (or perhaps even better: quae tu ipse intelligis responderi posse respondeas.) XI 7, 6. Read: T(ulliam) flagitare, for te f. XI 7, 5. Read: Sed totum *ἦθος* Balbus sustinet. XI 23, 3. Read: audimus enim testaturi eludi: generum, ne nostrum potissimum *ἦθος* (sc. sequeretur or sequi videretur), vel tabulas novas (sc. promulgare). XII 44, 3. Read: solet omnino (sc. Philotimus) esse *φιλομαθής*. XIII 19, 5. Read: eiusque partes. XIII 25, 3 fin. Read: si umquam quicquam tam *ἐν παρέργῳ*. Ne Tironi quidem. XIII 40, 2. Read: ad quem, ut audio, pater hodie. *ἀπάξεται ἀφρονοῦντα*. XIII 41, 1. Read: significavi me Non. fore. August 5 was foreseen as the day of young Cicero's home-coming. XIII 42, 3. Read: eatur

μία ἐξόδος (or μᾶς ἐξόδου?). On p. 330, note 20, K. Rupprecht suggests as better: eatur. μᾶς ἐξόδου videbimus te igitur. XIV 14, 1. Read: de αἰρέσει . . . et de Φαίάκων more. XV 4, 1. Read: Ad recentiorem prius et leniorem. Laudo! . . . cui quidem ista credo. Punctuate: spectare videtur. Siquidem . . . eripitur, etc . . . rides. XV 15, 1. For *id* read *id'* = 14 = quater decies centena milia sestertium. XV 17, 1. Read: ego de itinere nisi explicato (sc. sestertio) λ' nihil cogito. II. Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem. I 2, 13. The text needs no change. Between the two Greek quotations the *et* might be replaced by a dash. II 3, 5. For *ista ei* read *Stati(um)*. II 5, 1 (= 4, 3). For *autem* read αἰθαίμ(ονος). II 9(8), 2. Read: sicut εἰδέναι ἀέζησας, numquam enim dicam ἔδρασας. II 9, 3. Read: non ἀλύπητοι, sed ἀτάρακτοι (ira?). II 14, 1. Tucker's ἀναπληρώσεις is right. III 1, 7. Read ὅψι for *quasi*; also: nihil te recordari de sc. (i. e. senatus consulto), de epistulis, etc.

Pp. 331-348. H. Blümner, Kritisch-exegetische Bemerkungen zu Petrons Cena Trimalchionis. C. 27, 4, read: et quidem iam principem cenae videtis. C. 29, 5 read: quorum imam partem. Translate sub eodem titulo "with the same inscription." C. 35, 3 f.: *oclopetam* should perhaps be *octopoda*. Plin. N. H. IX 84 says: Lolligo etiam volitat extra aquam se efferens . . . sagittae modo. But the lolligo sagittata has the shape of an arrow and a fringe like arrow-feathers. This fact would explain why it might be put under the sign of Sagittarius. C. 39, 5: for *colei* read *consules*. C. 43, 4: translate *involavit* "pocketed" not "stole" as in C. 58, 10. C. 44, 6 ff.: read *ventilabat* for *vel pilabat* for which *tractabat* was a gloss. C. 44, 12. The point of comparison is the fact that a calf's tail is disproportionately large, so that he seems to grow faster backwards. C. 45, 11: read *occidit de placenta equites*. C. 46, 5: read *scit quidem litteras*. C. 58, 8 f.: read *quid de nobis?* three times. As in Greek, so in Latin, this was probably the stock phrase introducing a riddle, although this seems to be a unique example. That *minor* (not *minus*) is found is typical of the freedman's grammar. The answers to the riddles are: the foot; the gnomon on a sun-dial; and the shadow. C. 64, 1: for the sanctity of the dinner-table compare Plut. Quaest. conv. VII 4, 7 p. 704 B. and Aet. Rom. 64 p. 279 E. C. 65, 2: *ova pilleata* may have been hard-boiled eggs served with half the shell removed. C. 69, 6 f.: read *mirabor, nisi omnia ista de cera facta sunt aut certe de luto*.

MISCELLEN.

Pp. 349-351. R. Foerster, Ἑλλόβιον, nicht ἑλλέβορος. The passages cited for ἑλλέβορος go back to a single source, a false

reading in which was taken over by Pollux V 101, Clemens Alex. Paed. II 12 § 124 and Hesychius.

Pp. 351-355. H. Rubenbauer and G. Dittmann, Fulmen = Stütze? The assumption of a word *fulmen* from *fulcio*, as printed in the ninth edition of Heinichen's Schulwörterbuch, is unwarranted. The correct reading of Manilius II 892 is *culmina*.

Pp. 356-359. E. Hoppe, Die Entwicklung des Infinitesimalbegriffs. The concept of the infinitesimal is to be found first, not in Archimedes, but in Plato's Philebus, 17 A-27 D. Its clear development is probably Plato's most substantial achievement in the field of mathematics. Had Democritus had this knowledge, his summation of the many minute prisms inside the pyramid would have been changed to integration, i. e. the infinite summation of the ever changing surfaces. Archimedes completely carries out Plato's idea in his recently (1906) discovered *ἔφοδος*, in which he performs the first integration between finite limits on the segment of a parabola with the ordinates on the axis. It cannot be proved that Archimedes was acquainted with Plato's ideas, but as the quadrature of the parabola was cited previously in a special book, it is quite possible that Archimedes arrived independently at the concept of the infinitesimal. In any case Archimedes and Plato fared alike in that they were not understood by their followers. The only Greek mathematician who has used the *ἔφοδος* is Heron of Alexandria who used propositions 1, 11, and 12 in his Metric.

Pp. 359-362. N. Wecklein, Zur Medea des Euripides. The defective motivation of the Aegeus-scene in the Medea seems to have been censured as early as Aristotle (Poet. 1461 b 19). E. Bethe in his "Medea-probleme" clears the poet of ignorance of the technique of his art, for he makes his ambition to please the Athenians responsible for the blemish. Bethe assumes that the first draft of the Medea did not include the Aegeus-scene but placed the Jason-scene before the Kreon-scene. Wecklein admits that Euripides wished to praise Athens, but declares that it is unnecessary to assume any complete first draft of the play. The third stasimon, 824 ff., and the close of the drama are closely connected with the Aegeus-scene. While working out the play the poet must have decided to make the latter addition in order to make possible the insertion of the Aegeus-scene. The real motive for the murder of the children is revenge on Jason their father. Bethe's assumption of a second motive, fear that the kinsmen of the royal house might slay the children, is to be rejected.

Pp. 312-366. Th. Birt, Zu Marius Maximus. Spartianus

in the life of Geta 2, 1 writes: *de cuius vita et moribus in vita Severi Marius Maximus primo septenario satis copiose scripsit*. Severus was addicted to astrology and fond of the number seven; his very name Septimius suggests it. Marius Maximus unquestionably used the emperor's autobiography. He might have called his work *libri planetarii*, had the word *planetarius* been current; so he called it *libri septenarii*. Birt attempts to apportion the events of Severus' life between two books of seven divisions each.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

UNION COLLEGE.

HERMES LV (1920), 3 and 4.

Zu Philodems Schrift über die Frömmigkeit (225-278). R. Philippson has completed a work that shows that the entire criticism of the gods in antiquity was based on Epicurean criticism, beginning about the second century B. C. The present high cost of printing has induced him to publish the section dealing with the Herculanean fragments of Philodemus' *Περὶ εὐσεβείας*, which, as is well known, contains the fullest exposition of the Epicurean criticism; its agreement with Cicero's *De natura deorum* I, Lucian's *Ζεὺς τραγῳδός*, Clemens Alexandrinus' *προτρεπτικός* etc. was first pointed out by J. Dietze, *Fleck. Jbb.* 153 (1896), pp. 218 ff. With the aid of stichometric data, emendations, the *προτρεπτικός* etc., he establishes, as he thinks, a fairly correct sequence of the fragments. Thereupon he presents the emended text, which is based on Gomperz' text (1866) and the Naples collection of fragments, beginning with the introduction and continuing with the criticism of the poets and mythologers. The mythological sources are discussed.

Religionsgeschichtliches in der *Historia Augusta* (279-295). J. Geffcken shows that the passages dealing with religion confirm the observation of historians, that the earlier part of the *Historia Augusta*, which is based on Marius Maximus, is notably freer from forgery than the part lying beyond his time. In the earlier part the vitae deal with religion *sine ira et studio* and show little forgery; but beginning with Severus Alexander, forgery and perversion in the sphere of religion is unmistakable. This emperor, e. g., is said (29, 2) to have had: in *larario suo* . . . Apollonium . . . Christum, Abraham et Orfeum. Such a conglomeration was only possible in the fourth century of our era. Other curious examples of forgery are discussed, which reveal the aim of the learned author to incline his Christian readers to observe a liberal attitude towards the heathen religion; at the same time, in a covert manner, he deals out blows on Christianity.

Über den Ursprung der *Historia Augusta* (296-310). E. Hohl, in full accord with the preceding article of Geffcken, as well as with Dessau (cf. *A. J. P.* XII 115; see also pp. 379 f.), shows that the author of the *Historia Augusta* was a grammarian, who was associated with the family of Symmachus, the champion of the heathen party towards the close of the fourth century of our era. This aristocratic circle was active in its efforts to revive interest in Roman literature, of which Macrobius gives a vivid picture. That the fictitious scriptores were projected back to the era of Diocletian and Constantine is due to the forger's avoidance of the period when the Christian party predominated.

Hipparchos und Themistocles (311-318). I. K. J. Beloch upholds his view (*Gr. G.* I² 2 pp. 294 ff.) against E. v. Stern (*Hermes* LII [1917], pp. 354 ff.) that Hipparchus was the oldest of Peisistratus' sons and was the ruler of Athens when he was assassinated by Harmodius and Aristogiton. He discusses the passages in Thucydides and Herodotus bearing on this question, and especially stresses, as contemporary evidence, the Harmodius song: *ὄτε τὸν τύραννον κτανέτην, ἰσονόμους δ' Ἀθήνας ἐποησάτην*. The murder of a younger brother could not have shaken the stability of the tyrannical government. Thucydides depended on legends, and, being embittered by his banishment, desired to minimize the importance of the popular heroes of the democracy; hence he contaminated two versions: the vulgate, according to which the tyrant Hipparchus was assassinated, and his own version that they had planned to kill the 'tyrant' Hippias. Thucydides' account (VI, 54 ff.; 1, 20, 2) is certainly open to question, for when the conspirators surmised that the plot had been revealed to Hippias, it would have been natural for them to flee.—II. Beloch elucidates his view (*Gr. Gesch.* II² 2 pp. 134 f.) that Themistocles was not a demagog like Clisthenes or Ephialtes, but belonged to the party of the *γνώριμοι*, like Cimon. Rosenberg (*Hermes* LIII [1918], 308 f.) mistakenly charges him with describing Themistocles as a reactionary. Beloch further maintains, against R., that the Alcmeonids were responsible for the law (488/7 B. C.) requiring that the archons be elected by lot.

Miscellen: A. Rosenberg (319-321) interprets an inscription from the Turkish village Adanda (*Mon. Ant.* XXIII 1914), which dedicated a building to the emperor Gallienus *ἐπὶ Ἀ. Ὑκουνίου Ζήνωνος τοῦ διασημοτάτου ἡγεμόνος ἐπὶ παιδείας* (= a studiis) *τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ*. The title shows that Zeno belonged to the equestrian order, which makes this the third example, in the reign of Gallienus, of a senatorial province governed by an eques (cf. Keyes, *The Rise of the Equites*, Princeton Diss.,

1915). The curator (λογιστής) was a citizen of the place, which adds another exception to the rule. The honorific κτίστης is noteworthy.—Fr. Berdolet (321-323) defends the reading of Palatinus X in Lysias *περὶ τοῦ σηκοῦ* 12: τῷ ἀφανίσαντι . . . τῷ ποιήσαντι against the conjectures <μοι> ἀφανίσαντι . . . <περὶ> ποιήσαντι (cf. Thalheim, editio maior).—U. Wilcken (324-325) having noticed a change in the writing of lines 4-8 in the subscriptio to the Didymus papyrus, concludes that they were a later addition; hence the original 1-3: Διδύμων *περὶ Δημοσθένους* κη must mean: 'the twenty-eighth book of Didymus on Demosthenes, and thus he now sides with Leo against Diels, Blass and Wendland. φιλιππικῶν γ, which follows, means that the above book is at the same time the third of those that deal with the Philippics.—O. Weinreich (325) adds to K. Holl's evidence as to the continued existence of the Cappadocian language (cf. A. J. P. XXXII 466) a citation from Xenophon of Ephesos: καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἰππόθοος ἐμπείρως εἶχε τῆς Καππαδοκῶν φωνῆς καὶ αὐτῷ πάντες ὡς οἰκείῳ προσεφέροντο, but Xenophon's date is uncertain.—O. Weinreich (326-329) adds to the examples of hair-offerings to Helios a passage from Xenophon of Ephesos (V, 11).—E. Hedicke (328-329) emends τῆς to τις in Dionys. of Hal., Arch. Rom., V 70 ἦν δ' ἄρα ἡ κρείττων ἀρχὴ <τις> κατὰ νόμους τυραννίς, and explains how the senate, when the power of the consuls had been weakened by P. Valerius Publicola's ius de provocatione, created the dictatorship, which with its greater authority is characterized as a kind of legal tyranny.—E. Hedicke (330-334) observes that the misplaced leaves in the text of the archetype of the *στρατηγήματα* of Sex. Julius Frontinus (cf. Hermes VI p. 156) equaled about 110 Teubner lines, which indicates the transposition of a quaternio, not merely of one or two leaves. He illustrates this by means of parallel columns of cod. Harleianus 2666, his revised text and—by way of contrast—Oudendorp's text. He adds some remarks on the various mss., of which Harleianus 2666 appears to be the best, although he has not collated them all.—A. Alt (334-336) criticizes E. Meyer's attempt to derive πύργος, in the sense of an industrial building, from a primitive tower (cf. A. J. P. XLII 345).—Correction of misprints at Hermes LV pp. 187 and 223.

Die Entstehung des sogenannten Foedus Cassianum und des latinischen Rechts (337-363). A. Rosenberg tries to determine the context of the foedus Cassianum from Cic. pro Balbo 53, Dionys. Hal. Arch. Rom. VI 95, Festus, etc. Dionysius gives only a part of the document, which he must have derived from some careless annalist. He, further, discusses the Latin privilege of voting with the Roman tribus, which must have been included in the above foedus Cassianum; but as the elections of the Roman tribus would have signified little until the lex

Hortensia had been adopted 287 B. C., he concludes that the so-called foedus Cassianum was subsequent to that date and discards the traditional date 493 B. C. (cf. Cic. pro Balbo 53). Moreover, the foedus in question must have preceded the granting of the privileges to the group of twelve Latin colonies, which were modeled after those granted Ariminum 268 B. C. The well-known resemblance of the foedus C. to the Greek *ισοπολιτεία*, the origin of which cannot be traced further back than 300 B. C., leads him to conclude that this institution of a two-fold citizenship, which was contrary to Roman principles, was in fact adopted from the Greeks at the time of Pyrrhus' invasion, when Rome felt the need of bringing about a closer union with the Italian cities.

Zu Philodems Schrift über die Frömmigkeit IV (364-372). R. Philippson continues his discussion of the first book of the *περὶ εὐσεβείας*, which contained the criticism of the philosophers (see above).

Die Hera von Tiryns (373-387). C. Robert examines the evidence on which Frickenhaus (Tiryns. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts in Athen I) bases his hypothesis that the oldest temple and worship of Hera were located at Tiryns (cf. Paus. II 17, 5; Clem. Alex. Protrept. IV 47, 5; Euseb. Praep. Ev. III 8, 1 etc.), and concludes that the evidence proves rather that the original heraeon was at Argos. The large number of clay figures found at Tiryns of girls carrying pigs indicate a sanctuary of Demeter. The question as to what divinity was worshipped in the seventh-century temple at Tiryns remains to be solved. Robert looks forward to Dörpfeld's discussion of the subject.

Honestos (388-426). E. Preuner presents a study of the epigrams of Honestus and their respective monuments, which proceeds along the lines suggested by Dessau (cf. A. J. P. XXXVII 490). The identification of the Julia epigram is corroborated and elucidated in detail. The *Φιλέταυρος Εὐμένου* who dedicated the Thamyris monument was one of the Attalids of Pergamon, third century B. C.; but his identification is still an open question. Whether Thamyris was represented in relief or in the round is uncertain (cf. Paus. IX 30, 2). The epigrams describing the Muses are emended and elucidated, and the character of these monuments considered (cf. Paus. IX 30, 1). The praise of peace in the epigram to *Θάλλα* together with the phrase *εἰρήνης διςσὰ φάη* of the Julia epigram point to the Ara Pacis as a terminus post quem. The fact that the dedicatory inscription to the Muses is in the Boeotian dialect, shows that these monuments were erected not later than the early part of the second century B. C., as from this time on the *κοινή*

was in official use. The Honestus epigrams, of course, were added subsequently. Honestus seems to have received the impulse to write his Thespian epigrams from the proximity of this place to Thebes for which he wrote Anth. Pal. IX 216, 250. The monuments of Thebes had formed the basis for the *Ἐπιγράμματα Θηβαϊκά* of the Aristarchean Aristodemus (cf. Hermes XXXVI, p. 58; A. J. P. XXIII 332). In language and style Kaibel classified Honestus with Antipater and Philippos of Thessalonice and Leonidas of Alexandria (cf. Comment. Mommsen (1877) p. 334). Honestus' Theban epigrams are remarkably similar to Philippos Anth. Pal. IX 253, and the Julia epigram to Thallos, l. c., VII 373. Preuner thinks that Greek was not his native tongue.

Die Fanniusfrage (427-442). F. Münzer emends and elucidates Cicero's letter to Atticus XII 5, 3, with especial regard to the error in Brutus 99 ff. where a C. Fannius C. f., consul and orator, is distinguished from the historian C. Fannius M. f.; whereas the consul-orator was also Marci filius and identical with the historian (cf. Hendrickson A. J. P. XXVII 198).

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

REVIEWS.

The Owl Sacred Pack of the Fox Indians, by TRUMAN MICHELSON. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 72). Washington, Government Printing Office, 1921.

The ethnological value of the text here presented by MICHELSON is evident: it gives the users' view of a Fox sacred bundle,—the story of its origin, a detailed statement of the ceremonies connected with it, and the text of the songs.

Linguistically this publication is not only the most accurate Algonquian text at our disposal, but is a model of text-presentation in general. What this means everyone will know who has worked outside of a few better-known Indo-European languages. There are many books about language, but very little of human speech is known to science. In the field of Algonquian, for instance, the books, with a few exceptions, such as the work of William Jones and this of MICHELSON, contain little beyond an array of inaccurate paradigms constructed on the Latin model and some pseudo-philosophizing on whatever grammatical categories happen to be foreign to the author's native speech. The phonetics are usually bad; of connected discourse or of word-formation nothing is told. Even Jones, who was part Fox and must have had good knowledge of the tongue, was unable, for want of linguistic training, to make an adequate description. Not only did he confuse his paradigms, but he arrived at no clear statement of such features as the "obviative" (the peculiar subsidiary third person of Algonquian grammar), and what little he gave of word-formation was full of errors. He was able, however, thanks to his native flair, to collect texts more accurate, more copious, and, above all, more intimate, than any before. It was his work¹ that really opened the field of Algonquian to science. Most inappropriately, Jones, invaluable for Algonquian, was sent to the Philippines, where he met his death. It is for-

¹ *Algonquian (Fox)*, by William Jones, revised by Truman Michelson, in *Handbook of American Indian Languages*, by Franz Boas, Part I (Bulletin 40 of the Bureau of American Ethnology), Washington, 1911.

Fox Texts, by William Jones (Publications of the American Ethnological Society, volume 1), Leyden (Brill), 1907.

Ojibwa Texts, collected by William Jones, edited by Truman Michelson (same series, vol. 7), part 1, Leyden (Brill) 1917; part 2, New York (Stechert), 1919.

Kickapoo Tales, collected by William Jones, translated by Truman Michelson (same series, vol. 9), Leyden (Brill), 1915.

fortunate that MICHELSON, a scholar of the best Indo-European training, is carrying on the work.

One can imagine few more fascinating experiences in the study of mankind than to hear an Algonquian language spoken and to appreciate upon closer study the marvellous complexity of what one has heard. The scientific problem is correspondingly difficult. I believe that the solution, short of giving linguistic training to a native speaker, lies in the way of *sich einleben*—the notation of everyday speech and the attempt to become, to whatever extent is possible, a member of the speech-community. In the case of the Fox the external difficulties also are enormous; this people, treated with cruelty such as few have met, will scarcely admit one of the "Knife-People" to great familiarity; for the rest, trachoma is endemic, involving a price which MICHELSON has paid,—fortunately without permanent harm. As Fox is the most archaic of the Algonquian languages, its study cannot be replaced by that of the others.

The complexity of Fox appears in the circumstance that even MICHELSON finds in this text inflections hitherto unknown to him, and one or two features that he cannot understand; and indeed, one may know a good deal of an Algonquian language (as such things go) and yet hear a five-year-old child use an inflection or a stem that one has not heard before.

If one may judge from a comparison with the texts published by Jones, from the internal evidence furnished by grammatical analysis, and from comparison with the closely related Menomini, the present text is admirably reproduced. It will be invaluable for the future of Algonquian research—if, indeed, linguistic studies are to have any future. It is safe to presume that MICHELSON'S phonetics are impeccable. One could wish that some of the phonetic finesses had been dealt with by a once-for-all statement rather than by diacritical marks and superposed letters, so as not to clutter up the page (as some Greek said), and to keep it from being what Schopenhauer used to call *Augenpulver*. Thus, the inverted apostrophe is used instead of the letter *h*; the *h*-glide which precedes every sibilant is written every time; superposed *k*'s and *d*'s are used to indicate the acoustic effect of unvoiced solution-lenets; the lengthened sound of nasals in final syllables is marked by superposed letters; the peculiar twist of the diphthongal succession *ay* is uniformly rendered by writing *aiy*. A clearer page will help the reader more than such constant reminders of phonetic details which are uniform throughout the language; the more so, as no transcription, however painstaking, can reproduce the acoustic effect of a language one has not heard. In the case of the open and closed sounds of *a*, tradition is in favor of using two symbols, although the present text shows that the variation is

automatic. In one matter the meticulousness of the transcription is especially inconvenient; as the *h*-off-glide of final vowels is uniformly indicated, one cannot distinguish it, except by laborious comparison, from a significant *h* which has become final through loss of vowel in sandhi: thus a word ending in *-a* is often indistinguishable from a word ending in *-ahi* (with *i* lost in sandhi). The investigator, having learned which features are significant, should give the reader the benefit of his knowledge; this I take to be the real value of phonetic transcription. The separation of words should be more fully carried out; especially successive particles are run together in a troublesome way. As word-division is not a phonetic matter, the reader will be helped if one writes, e. g. *kegimesi meg ōn* rather than *kegimesimegōn* (14, 22).² MICHELSON'S is the first Fox text to be given with accentuation. It appears that while word-accent is not significant, the sentence-accent is complex and interesting. The difficult printing is practically faultless; I have noticed only 28, 36, end of line: read hyphen instead of period.

The translation is careful and close. I venture, with due respect to the difficulties of Fox, to suggest:

14, 20: *āhwāpihatamāhetiwātcī they begin to cause each other to smoke* (i. e. *to give each other a smoke*), rather than *they begin to be given a smoke together*; to cause people to do something together is rather *-etī-* plus instrumental *-h-*: *ānānu-wasutihānitcī they caused them to race with each other*, Jones 208, 5.

16, 40: The text seems to say *By no means* (*āgwi gāh māmahkātci*) *the women who belong to the gens*, (but rather) *the invited women are the ones who join in the singing*; the translation given by MICHELSON makes more plausible sense, but does not account for the negative in the text.

26, 3: *nīyōnanākwiwīneyā* sounds like *head* or *horns* rather than *ears*, but Algonquian songs are desperate.

28, 33: *Not earlier or later* (*nōta*), *but by all means in the evening* (as opposed to night), *that is when the burial is to be completed*. Construction and verb-form do not admit of connecting the negative with the verb.

50, 39: *Verily, if their bodies get well, do not try to trouble them*. The verb-form has animate object, hence cannot refer to the inanimate *uwīyawāwi*, which, moreover, is preempted as subject of *icigenig*. Correspondingly emend the note, p. 69.

52, 40: *that there might thus be benefiting, that we might thus please the people*. For it is probable that the novel inflection *-inamegi* is the impersonal passive of a transitive verb with animate object.

²For typographical reasons I quote in simplified transcription and without accent-marks.

In view of the inadequacy of Jones' *Sketch*, one wishes that the linguistic notes on pp. 68 ff. were more extensive. Especially some syntactic comments would be helpful. The present text, being a direct statement, throws light on some points that are obscured in the narrative of Jones' *Texts*, with its persistent use of the aorist. The Fox use of independent and conjunct verbs, it appears, is much like that of Ojibwa and Menomini.

To the note on § 12 one may add the example in Jones' *Texts* 348, 1 (same verb as here). It is generally true that in Central Algonquian there are two types of derivatives from nouns and verbs ending in *-wa* and *-wi*: an older stratum, in which the *w* is not included, and a newer, in which the derivation is made from the full stem in *-w*. The short stem before instrumental *-m-* appears also in *tāpesimāwa* *he is happy with him*, cited by MICHELSON, *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1, 6.

On § 28: For treatment of the stem before *-tuge*, cf. *nemat-cināgōtuge* *he probably holds me in slight esteem*, *Texts* 60, 4; *mehkamūtuge* *he probably found it*, *ib.* 122, 7.

§ 34: *-tisō-*, as reflexive stem from transitive verb with double object, occurs in Jones' *Texts*: *panāpatamātisōwa* *he ceases to see it for himself*, 382, 7; *pītigatātisōwa* *he carries it in for himself*, 250, 23, illustrating both types of double-object inflection. *-tisō-* reflexive from other stems at 284, 2. 286, 22.

§ 41(b): *-asō-*, reflexive-passive, occurs in Jones' *Texts* 220, 8. 12. 380, 8.

§ 41(c): *-āgusi-* (animate), *-āgwat-* (inanimate), reflexive-passive, in Jones' *Texts* 138, 20. 156, 22. 18. 204, 20. 340, 20. 380, 3; also *nōtāgusiwa* *he is heard*, *Sketch*, 744.

Page 71: I question whether the *w* of *-wetci* is an instrumental, and believe Jones' instrumental *-w-* to be altogether an error, except for a few irregular verbs, where it is rather part of the stem.

The list of sound-variations on page 72 is invaluable, the more so, as much of it applies also to other Central Algonquian; it is entirely the product of MICHELSON's researches. On the same page is given a table of the instrumental suffixes. The transitive verb in Algonquian is inflected not only for the actor, but also for the object; before the inflectional endings there is an element, called the instrumental, which indicates the nature of the action (by tool, by hand, by mouth, by heat, by cutting edge, etc.). In most cases the instrumental differs according to the gender, animate or inanimate, of the object; accordingly, the author here arranges them in two parallel columns. The first pair, however, is a mistake: where the verb with animate object has instrumental *-h-*, that with inanimate object has *-htō-* (not *-h-* as here given). These stems are a living (freely

formed) derivation in Menomini with transitive-causative meaning, and the examples in the published texts suggest that the same is true in Fox; they are:³

animate object	inanimate object
ketemāgihāwa	ketemāgihtōwa <i>makes pitiful</i> , 56, 21. 204, 18.
tanwāwāgihāwa	anwāwāgihtōwa <i>makes resound</i> , 26, 18. 118, 1.
sōgihāwa	sōgihtōwa <i>binds</i> , 140, 7. 146, 1.
kaskihāwa	kaskihtōwa <i>controls</i> , 166, 21. 180, 11.
wanihāwa	wanihtōwa <i>loses</i> , 182, 11. MICHELSON.

American Anthropologist, n. s., 15, 473.

acihāwa	acihtōwa <i>makes</i> , 32, 1. 254, 15.
kīcihāwa	kīcihtōwa <i>finishes</i> , 24, 26. 254, 15.
mōcihāwa	mōcihtōwa <i>dreams of</i> , 24, 7. <i>Owl Pack</i> , 34, 34.
panātcihāwa	panātcihtōwa <i>ruins</i> , 116, 18. 274, 21.
apwihāwa	apwihtōwa <i>awaits</i> , 212, 18. 214, 21. 262, 1.

For the instrumental for action with a tool, which has -hw- for animate objects, MICHELSON leaves the inanimate-object form undetermined; it has the form -h-. It is freely made in Menomini, and here, too, the examples accessible to me indicate that the same is true in Fox:

tcāgahwāwa	tcāgahamwa <i>finishes up</i> , 116, 15. 314, 8.
sīgahwāwa	sīgahamwa <i>pours</i> , 258, 19. 264, 10.
sahkahwāwa	sahkahamwa <i>burns</i> , 30, 2. 66, 11.
patahkahwāwa	patahkahamwa <i>pierces</i> , 104, 2. 176, 15.
kehkahwāwa	kehkahamwa <i>points out</i> , 18, 12. 20, 7.
kaskahwāwa	kaskahamwa <i>controls</i> , 46, 10. 176, 8.
kāskāskahwāwa	kāskāskahamwa <i>scrapes</i> , 178, 19. 21.
panahwāwa	panahamwa <i>misses</i> , <i>Sketch</i> 742. 807.
pīnahwāwa	pīnahamwa <i>puts in</i> , 96, 13. 116, 23.
āpinahwāwa	āpinahamwa <i>unties</i> , 78, 4. 290, 22.
pagisahwāwa	pagisahamwa <i>hurls</i> , 12, 20. 372, 7.
anwāwāhwāwa	kukwätwāwāhamwa <i>makes resound</i> , 270, 8. 348, 23. (kukwät- <i>try</i>).
pasigumāhwāwa	kīnigumāhamwa <i>acts on nose</i> , 104, 1. <i>Sketch</i> , 768. (pasi- <i>graze</i> , kīni- <i>sharpen</i>).
natunāhwāwa	natunāhamwa <i>seeks</i> , 58, 11. 278, 5. (instrumental conventionalized).
āpihwāwa	āpihamwa <i>unties</i> , 28, 2. 172, 17.
nasāhkuhwāwa	nasāhkuhamwa <i>roasts on spit</i> , 92, 5. 174, 16.

In the case of the instrumental -t- (-ht-) with inanimate object distinction should be made between the two types of inflection -t- (-ht-) and -tō- (-htō-); the matter is complex, but

³ For simplicity's sake I give always the third person singular independent; numbers are page and line of Jones' Texts.

there seems to be some agreement between the different languages.

Some mention should have been made of irregular verbs, which Jones did not take up in his *Sketch*. For one of them the form with animate object is now quotable: *āwāwa he uses him*, present text, 14, 16; the form with inanimate object *ayōwa he uses it*, Jones, *Texts* 30, 15; all the occurrences in Jones, *Texts*, are reduplicated; the simple form is used in Menomini: *āw* or *uah he uses it*; would be Fox *ōwa. The form with -t-instrumental mentioned in the list of stems does not seem to occur in the the published Fox material; in Menomini this is a different verb: *ōnāw he affects him by using, uses on him*, *ōtam* same, with inanimate object; this is a normal meaning for the instrumental -n:-t-.

The book is completed by a very useful list of the stems that occur in the text. It is to be hoped that MICHELSON will use his qualifications, so rare in a field of this kind, to give us a grammar, as complete as may be, of this beautiful but self-willed language of the Sauks and Foxes.

LEONARD BLOOMFIELD.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

The Phonology of the Bakhtiari, Badakhshani, and Madaglashti Dialects of Modern Persian, with Vocabularies. By Major D. L. R. LORIMER. (Prize Publication Fund, Vol. VI of the Royal Asiatic Society.) London, 1922. Pages xi + 205.

This prize publication volume gives a very useful study of two widely separated sets of Modern Iranian dialects, namely, the Bakhtiari in Southwestern Persia and the Badakhshani in Northeastern Afghanistan with the Madaglashti of the Chitral district. These dialects therefore represent respectively certain linguistic phases of eastern and western Iran.

Major LORIMER writes of his subject at first hand, and is evidently a careful recorder, though he modestly says of his contribution that 'it would be futile for an amateur to attempt to beguile the professional philologist,' and he leaves to the latter to judge of the merits and demerits of the work. Since he wrote at different times and sometimes out of reach of books, he adds a Postscript, on pp. 19-20, calling attention to some equations that might be made between his own transcription (his 'long signs really represent quality, and not length') and the symbols employed in the International Phonetic Association. On his desk he nevertheless had a goodly number of Iranian philological works, including *Bartholomae's Altiranisches*

Wörterbuch, the Iranian *Grundriss*, and the contributions of Horn, Hübschmann, Soane, Tolman, and others, so that Avestan, Old Persian, Pahlavi, and Modern Persian are taken well into account. All this adds to the worth of the book.

Shrewd general observations are made in the Introduction regarding the tribes of the Bakhtiari, typical shepherds, cattle-owners, and nomads, and concerning the outside linguistic influences, like the Persian, Turkish, and Arabic, which tend to modify their speech. The collection of phonological data which follows contains much valuable material. Equally important to the scholar is the Bakhtiari vocabulary, occupying pages 101-126.

The dialects of the people of Badakhshan and of Madaglasht, as belonging to the Afghan region, are treated side by side in the second half of the book. In respect to these latter dialects the Major admits (p. 128) that his sources of information were 'very restricted and my informants did not make up for their deficiency in number by any special brilliance of intellect.' His studies, however, lead him to the conclusion (p. 129) that 'these two dialects, which appear to be historically one and do not differ in any essential respect, are merely a form of the ordinary Modern Persian of Persian literature known as "Classical Persian."' With regard to Madaglashti we should naturally expect this result, because (p. 127) the people who use it are 'a small settlement of Persian-speaking foreigners planted in the middle of the principality of Chitral' some six generations ago. The appended vocabularies of Badakhshani and Madaglashti furnish enough material to judge by, though the Iranian specialist has something phonological or etymological to solve in such words as B. M. *lakik*, 'finger,' *fāridan*, 'to wish, desire,' and M. *alaxšā*, 'jaw.'

It is worth while for the philologist to have this prize publication for use in future linguistic researches in the Iranian field.

A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Die altpreussischen Ortsnamen, gesammelt und sprachlich behandelt. Von GEORG GERULLIS, Privatdozent für indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft in Königsberg. Berlin und Leipzig 1922, Vereinigung wissenschaftlicher Verleger. 286 S.

The national revival in the Baltic states has, to a considerable extent, been responsible for increased activity in the study of their languages, although it has long been realized that probably

no other field is richer in unmined Indo-European material. Several important books have recently appeared, and in the near future we shall have Endzelin's collection of Lettish names, Trautmann's treatment of Old Prussian person-names, and, among other Baltic dictionaries, the monumental Lithuanian work that is being prepared under the direction of Professor Būga at the University of Kovno (which opened its doors in February).

Although the Old Prussian became extinct in relatively recent times (a lone old man who knew the language died in 1677, and there are vague, second-hand reports of others until about 1700), the linguistic remains are nevertheless so scanty and so encrusted with German elements that any real contribution to the available material is a matter of moment. The beginnings of a systematic collection of Old Prussian place-names were made by Pierson and Nesselmann, but their lists were limited in scope and drawn entirely from printed records and books. GERULLIS has not only covered the whole of Old Prussian territory, but he has worked through all available sources, both manuscript and printed, including chiefly the German records of the Teutonic Order during its three centuries of military conquest and political domination of the Slavic Prussians up to the year 1525. The search of the voluminous archives at Königsberg alone must have been an enormous task.

The result is an alphabetically arranged collection of Old Prussian place-names that I estimate to be 3000 in number. With each name are indicated the source and its date, and, so far as possible, the geographical location and the modern form. The name is divided into its elements, suffixal or compositional, and in the majority of cases parallels and etymologies are introduced from the Lettish or Lithuanian. The number of names capable of etymological explanation is gratifyingly large, and the material is of considerable comparative value. After the list of names come sixty-two pages of grammatical discussion: phonetics, compounds, suffixes, dialects, etc.

The book contains several misprints and other slight errors, but on the whole the work is very carefully done. And among so many details scholars will find here and there occasion for doubt or disagreement with the author. But the man on the ground has the prior right to opinion in most cases, and GERULLIS's opinion is always competent.

HAROLD H. BENDER.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

Ausonius: with an English Translation by HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE. Vol. II. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921. 367 pp.

This volume completes a good translation of the works of Ausonius in the Loeb Classical Library (A. J. P. XLI 298). The text is a pretty faithful reprint of Peiper's edition—even to such a spelling as *puerpura*, *Epig.* 66, 3. There are a few misprints: p. 48, 58, *abunda*, for *abundat*; p. 172, 2, *alvi*, for *alui*; p. 288, 7, *feceret*, for *faceret*; and the initial capitals should be restored to *Promoti*, p. 16, 40; *Probiano*, p. 38, 84; *Taurinus*, p. 46, 38. A couple of easy clauses are omitted, apparently by oversight: p. 233, 6, and p. 283, 11 (in *Sulpicia's* poem). On p. 29, n. 6, there is an odd expression: "*Sotadic* verse, which could be read backwards way." On p. 114 (*Ep.* 29, 21) the phrase '*tentis reboant cava tympana tergis*' might be compared with *Catullus*, 63, 21, *tympana reboant*, and 63, 10, *terga tauri . . . cava*. On p. 124 (*Ep.* 31, 2) the phrase '*cano bruma gelu*' comes from *Virgil*, *Geor.* 3, 442-3.

Mr. WHITE adds, as a sort of appendix, a text and translation of the *Eucharisticus* of *Paulinus Pellaeus*. The text is that of *Wilhelm Brandes* in the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vol. XVI—not Vol. XXVI, as is stated on p. 303. Here *hac* is printed for *hoc*, p. 314, 93, and *coepto* for *coeptos*, p. 326, 280. *Arabi muris*, p. 316, 148, is hardly '*myrrh*' of *Araby*; perhaps it is some kind of animal perfume.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

The Ruin of Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity, with some consideration of conditions in the Europe of today. By GUGLIELMO FERRERO. Translated by the Hon. Lady Whitehead. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921. Pp. vii + 210.

The temptation to misinterpret Rome for the sake of providing interesting parallels and object lessons for modern politics has been great during the last few years. In this book FERRERO has yielded to the temptation completely. The sermon he preaches in the last chapter of the book is briefly that the victors in the recent war must not impose on newly founded republics forms of government, however liberal, to which the people themselves are not accustomed and which they fail to understand, for the consequence is apt to be a revolt against constituted authority and presently anarchy. The text of the

sermon is provided by a none too objective review of Roman history from Septimius Severus to Constantine.

FERRERO would have us believe that before 200 A. D. Rome looked upon the Senate as the center of the government, and that under senatorial rule up to that day the world had been prosperous and law-abiding. When Septimius destroyed men's faith in the government by breaking the power of the Senate an era of anarchy ensued. Diocletian later attempted to get a logical basis for imperial absolutism by introducing the Oriental idea of a divine ruler and he partially succeeded. However Christianity, which refused to accept the idea of a divine emperor, was already so strong that Constantine had to surrender his claim to divinity, and without a divine ruler autocracy had no logical foundation. Hence once more supreme authority in the state failed to invite respect and Rome broke into fragments.

Needless to say this interpretation overstates the power of the Senate in the early part of the third century, gives too favorable a picture of Rome's prosperity before the period of anarchy, places the introduction of the imperial cult too late, and does violence to Christianity in portraying it as disobedient to secular authority. The real causes of Rome's decay, which were at work for centuries before the period of the Severi, are almost wholly ignored.

The book will doubtless be widely read, for FERRERO knows how to make a story effective by omitting all the facts that hamper the development of his dramatic plot. The translation omits phrases and sentences of the original here and there, whether by permission of the author, I cannot say. Otherwise, considering that the *ipsa verba* of the original are not of great importance, we may consider it adequate.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Bender, Harold H. *The Home of the Indo-Europeans*. Princeton, *Princeton University Press*, 1922. 58 pp. \$1.00 net.

Bickford, John Dean. *Soliloquy in Ancient Comedy*. 65 pp. 8°. Princeton University Diss. Princeton, *The Author*, 1922.

Bloch, G. *L'Empire romain, évolution et décadence*. Paris, *Ernest Flammarion*, 1922. 313 pp. 12°. 7.50 fr.

Calhoun, George Miller. ΕΠΙΣΚΗΨΙΣ and the ΔΙΚΗ ΨΕΤΔΟ-ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΩΝ. (*Classical Philology* XI, October, 1916, pp. 365-94.) ΠΑΡΑΓΡΑΦΗ and Arbitration. (*Ibid.* XIV, January, 1919, pp. 20-28.) Athenian Magistrates and Special Pleas. (*Ibid.* pp. 338-50.) Oral and Written Pleading in Athenian Courts. (*Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. L, 1919, pp. 177-93.)

Crabtree, W. A. *Primitive Speech. Part II. The Prefix System of Bantu*. vi + 72 pp. 8°. London, *Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.*, 1922. 5 sh. net.

Damsté, Onno. *Adversaria ad Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*. Utrecht diss. Rotterdam, *Electrische Handelsdrukkerij "De Gids,"* 1922. 64 pp. 8°.

Delatte, A. *Essai sur la Politique pythagoricienne*. (*Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège*, Fasc. XXIX.) 296 pp. 8°. Paris, *Edouard Champion*, 1922.

Diack, Francis C. *The Newton Stone and other Pictish Inscriptions*. 64 pp. 12°. Paisley, Scotland, *Alexander Gardner*, 1922.

Diccionari Aguiló. *Materials lexicogràfics aplegats per Marian Aguiló i Fuster. Revisats i publicats sota la cura de Pompeu Fabra i Manuel De Montoliu. Fascicle X. (Illa-lluytar.)* Barcelona, *Institut d'Estudis Catalans*, 1921.

Dornseiff, Franz. *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*. v + 177 pp. 8°. (ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Weltbildes usw. herausgegeben von Franz Boll, Heft VII.) Leipzig-Berlin, *B. G. Teubner*, 1922. Geheftet \$2, geb. \$2.50.

Dupréel, Eugène. *La Légende Socratique et les Sources de Platon*. Bruxelles, *Les Editions Robert Sand*, 1922. 450 pp. 8°.

Foulke, William Dudley. *A Hoosier Autobiography*. 252 pp. 8°. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1922. \$2.50.

Gollancz, Sir Israel. *Select Early English Poems. VII. Cleanness, an alliterative tripartite poem on the Deluge, the Destruction of Sodom, and the Death of Belshazzar, by the poet of Pearl*. London, *Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*, 1921. Pp. xxxii + 105. 8°.

Gover, J. E. B. *The Place Names of Middlesex*. (Including those parts of the county of London formerly contained within the boundaries of the old county.) xvi + 114 pp. 12°. London-New York, *Longmans, Green and Co.*, 1922. \$1.75 net.

Groeneboom, P. *Les Mimiambes d' Hérodas. I-VI. Avec notes critiques et commentaire explicatif*. 195 pp. 8°. Groningen, *P. Noordhoff*, 1922. 2 fr. 50.

- Gummere, Richard Mott. *Seneca the Philosopher and his Modern Message*. xvi + 150 pp. 16°. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome. Edited by George Depue Hadzsits and David Moore Robinson. No. 16.) Boston, *Marshall Jones Company*, 1922.
- * Herodas. *The Mimes and Fragments*. With Notes by Walter Headlam. Edited by A. D. Knox. lxiv + 465 pp. 8°. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1922; New York, *The Macmillan Company*.
- Hespéris. *Archives Berbères et Bulletin de l'Institut des Hautes-Études Marocaines, Année 1921. 3e Trimestre*. Paris, *E. Larose*.
- Holleaux, Maurice. *Rome, La Grèce et les Monarchies hellénistiques au 3e siècle avant J.-C. (273-205)*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Fasc. 124e.) Paris, *E. de Boccard*, 1921. 386 pp. 8°.
- Janvier, Ernest Paxton. *The Madhyama Vyāyoga*. A drama composed by the Poet Bhāsa. Translated from the original Sanskrit with Introduction and Notes. University of Pennsylvania Diss. 44 pp. 8°. Mysore, *Printed at the Wesleyan Mission Press*, 1921.
- Jespersen, Otto. *Language. Its nature, development and origin*. 448 pp. 8°. New York, *Henry Holt and Company*, 1922.
- Journal of Education and The School World*. London, June 1, 1922. Also the No. for July 1, 1922. Price 8d.; by Post, 10d. Annual Subscription (prepaid), 10s.
- Kunst, Karl. *Die Frauengestalten im Attischen Drama*. viii + 208 pp. 8°. Wien u. Leipzig, *Wilhelm Braumüller*, 1922.
- Lindsay, W. M., and Thomson, H. J. *Ancient Lore in Medieval Latin Glossaries*. (St. Andrews University Publications, No. XIII.) London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1921. xii + 185 pp. 8°.
- Merrill, William A. *The Lucretian Hexameter*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 5, No. 12, pp. 253-296.) Berkeley, Cal., *University of California Press*, 1922.
- Morris-Jones, Sir J. *An Elementary Welsh Grammar. Part I. Phonology and Accidence*. xv + 197 pp. 16°. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1922.
- Nutting, H. C. *Cicero's Conditional Clauses of Comparison*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology. Vol. 5, No. 11, pp. 183-251. April 21, 1922.)
- Philological Quarterly*. Vol. I, No. 2, April 1922. Iowa City, *Published at the University of Iowa*.
- Pliny. *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum libri decem*. Recensuit Elmer Truesdell Merrill. Lipsiae, *B. G. Teubner*, 1922. Pp. xxiv + 315. 8°. \$2.40.
- Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias*. Vol. XXXI, Núms. 3 y 4. Julio-Diciembre, 1921. Habana, *Universidad de la Habana*, 1921.
- Robinson, David M. *An Amphora of Nicosthenes in Baltimore*. (American Journal of Archaeology, Second Series, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, pp. 54-58, 1922.)
- Sandys, Sir J. E. *A Companion to Latin Studies*. Third Edition. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1921; New York, *The Macmillan Co.* xxxv + 891 pp. 8°.
- Sewanee Review*. Quarterly. Edited by George Herbert Clarke. April-June, 1922. Sewanee, Tenn., *The Sewanee Review, Inc.*

Tavener, Eugene. The Amulet in Roman Curative Medicine. (Washington University Studies, Vol. IX, Humanistic Series, No. 2, pp. 185-209, 1922.)

Thiel, Johannes Hendrik. ΖΕΝΟΦΩΝΤΟΣ ΠΡΟΛΟΓΟΙ. Cum Prolegomenis et Commentariis. Amsterdam Diss. xxxvi + 57 pp. 8°. Vindobonae, 1922.

University of Wales. The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies. Vol. I, Parts I and II. October, 1921; May, 1922. 191 pp. 8°. Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. Price per part 7s. 6d. net.

Vincent, Aug. Les diminutifs de noms propres de lieux. (Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire, Tome I, No. 2, Avril 1922, pp. 247-264.) Bruxelles, Les Editions Robert Sand.

Washington University Studies. Vol. IX, No. 2. Humanistic Series. Heller Memorial Volume. April, 1922. St. Louis, Mo., Washington University.

White, Hugh G. Evelyn. Ausonius with an English Translation. In two volumes. Vol. II. With the *Eucharisticus* of Paulinus Pellaeus. 367 pp. 12°. (The Loeb Classical Library.) London, William Heinemann; New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921.

